



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 2013

No. 37

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 14, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM MCCLINTOCK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the looming crisis of climate change. The effects of climate change are diverse, but they all impact American lives and livelihoods, and we are realizing and witnessing these occurrences in real-time.

Extreme weather events like Hurricane Sandy, severe drought, and major flooding are becoming more frequent and growing more intense. Sandy alone caused at least \$50 billion in damages,

killed dozens of Americans, and upended the lives of millions more. But Sandy was only one of 11 separate billion-dollar extreme weather events last year.

And not only are things getting worse each time, but these events are occurring more frequently now than they were even a decade ago. And of course, the cost of all these catastrophes—cost which is borne by the taxpayer—is also escalating.

One of the first actions of this Congress was to enact over \$60 billion in emergency aid for all those impacted by Sandy. Who knows how much the next catastrophe will cost?

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to sit back and wait for the next Hurricane Sandy to devastate American lives and property. Especially in these tight economic times, I think we can all agree that reducing the cost of extreme weather events is a good idea. And one of the most effective ways to reduce these costs is to plan ahead. Regardless of what you think about its causes, extreme weather is happening, and because we cannot guarantee that these events will not happen in the future, we can and we must do more to prepare. Imagine the lives, infrastructure, homes, and businesses that could have been saved if we'd better anticipated and prepared for the impacts of these events before they occurred.

By smarter planning and building more resilient infrastructure, we can reduce storm damages, we can lessen economic impacts, and we can save lives. And these mitigation and adaptation measures also create good quality American jobs that can help to grow our economy for the future. It's a win-win that we should all support.

That's why last month I reintroduced two bills that would help our local communities implement these cost-saving measures. One is the Coastal States Climate Change Planning Act, which would provide help for coastal

States who wish to carry out adaptation projects in order to prepare for the impacts of climate change. Another bill is the Water Infrastructure Resiliency and Sustainability Act, supporting States wishing to update their aging storm, waste, and drinking water systems in order to adapt for climate change. These bills would help our local communities to plan and prepare for the impacts of climate change and increased extreme weather. Our communities deserve protections from these potentially devastating events and we have a responsibility to help.

Mr. Speaker, we have a choice. We can continue to spend tens of billions of dollars annually on emergency aid packages that will only grow in size and quantity, or we can spend a fraction of that on planning smarter and building more resilient infrastructure that creates jobs and strengthens our economy for years to come.

I think the choice is clear. Let's choose to protect our coastlines and to fortify our infrastructure. Let's choose to create good American jobs and strengthen our economy. Let's choose to plan ahead to protect lives, to protect property, and the Federal Government itself from the impacts of extreme weather.

I urge my colleagues to join me in taking action on this critical issue and to help our communities to prepare for the impacts of climate change.

TAKE THE PADLOCKS OFF THE WHITE HOUSE DOORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Saturday was the day that Lanier Middle School students from Houston, Texas, had been looking forward to for a long time. They were going to get to see where the President of the United States lived. This was even more exciting because it was the first time in 5

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1401

years that Lanier had been successful in scheduling a tour of the White House. Then last week, 2 days before they were set to go on their tour, they got the bad news. They were no longer welcome in the people's house.

Mr. Speaker, I know one of the parents of the kids at Lanier Middle School. Here's what she said:

It's disappointing. But it is particularly disappointing to me because I think it teaches the kids a bad lesson of not keeping your word. I think that's bad for the kids.

Harvin Moore, a trustee from the Houston Independent School District, wrote the White House when he got the bad news, and here's what he said:

Next week, 80 students from Lanier Middle School will be spending their spring break touring our Nation's capital.

They have been planning the trip for a year. They have completed background checks and received confirmation that they would be welcomed to the White House and, as you can imagine, were very excited about that.

Now we find ourselves in the position of having to explain to them that their plans have been abruptly canceled and they will not be welcome at the White House after all.

Frankly, that's a hard thing to do as we don't understand the reason ourselves.

We don't understand why, out of a \$1.6 billion Secret Service budget, the administration believes that 1/100th of 1 percent that is required to fund the White House tours is one of the first things to go.

We don't understand why the administration would choose to cancel the program that touches the public the most, in return for a truly minuscule budget savings.

We don't understand, Mr. President, why you have chosen to disinvite schoolchildren from their White House.

The First Lady has referred to the White House as the "People's House." I agree with her. It is the "People's House—it is our house."

Mr. Moore continued in his letter:

One Lanier parent described having to tell her son he was no longer welcome at the White House: The word "sequester" doesn't mean anything to this student. First Lady Michelle Obama said that the White House is our house. Well, it doesn't feel like it anymore.

Mr. Speaker, Lanier students from Texas are not alone. Thousands of students nationwide are gearing up for spring break, and the cherry blossom festival is just a few weeks away. These trips require planning, time, and, yes, even money. Bake sales, car washes, parents taking time off of work were all involved so kids could come to Washington to tour the White House.

But the President, unfortunately, has punished the people for the sake of a few nickels. Perhaps the White House forgot what the First Lady has said, which is posted on the home page of whitehouse.gov:

This is really what the White House is all about. It's the "People's House."

Well, Mr. Speaker, if this is true, the President should take the padlocks off the White House doors, put the welcome mat back on the front porch, because America's kids should not be evicted from their White House.

Mr. Speaker, the open-door philosophy of the White House is a uniquely

American idea where the people of the country can come see where the President of the United States, the most powerful person in the world, actually lives.

□ 1010

This is uniquely American. You go to other countries and, whether they're democracies or not, they don't let you near the home of where the head leader lives. But only in America have we done this.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the President to keep his word. Let the people back in. And as students come to Washington, D.C., they should know that the U.S. Capitol is open for business and that Members of Congress, their staff, and the tour guides at the Capitol Visitor Center will be glad to take them through the Capitol. In fact, earlier this morning, there were about 70 kids from Westchester, New York, seated here before we opened for business, getting a history lesson from one of our Parliamentarians.

Mr. Speaker, the Capitol is open, but neither the White House nor the U.S. Capitol should ever close its doors and ban the people from the people's houses.

And that's just the way it is.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about the important, compelling issue of illegal immigration.

We've heard from the Gang of Eight in the Senate and now the Gang of Eight in the House. When we talk about illegal immigration, as a mayor I know what it did to my city. Aside from the crime and violence, it took a great toll on the economic vitality of the population. Our population grew by 50 percent but our tax base stayed the same. People who are here legally, especially the new American citizens, are looking for jobs. And they are scarce. Twenty-two million Americans are out of work. And now the proposal is to wave the carrot of citizenship to millions more? And when we are talking about giving amnesty to millions—maybe 20 million illegal aliens—how much more scarce will those jobs become?

Mr. Speaker, we have heard these proposals before. In 1986, we said that if we granted amnesty, there would only be about 1.5 million people who would be included. In truth, it turned out to be twice that amount. We were also told that it would never happen again. Our borders would be secure and this problem would never occur again. In truth, it was not true.

So now, 27 years later, our borders still aren't secure and here we are doing this all over again. Well, we got fooled once. By news reports, we are told that there are 11 million illegal

immigrants in this Nation right now. By using 1986 as a yardstick, we can guess that by offering amnesty there might be twice that many.

Mr. Speaker, we were told in 1986 that none of this would happen. But it did. Now we're talking about brand new expenses at a time when we really have no money to spare. This means Social Security, Medicare, unemployment compensation, ObamaCare, welfare, food stamps, you name it. The Heritage Foundation projects that currently illegal immigration today costs us \$55 billion a year, or \$550 billion over 10 years. Illegal immigrants today receive \$55 billion more in government benefits than they pay in taxes, based on the 2010 census. Worse, after so-called "amnesty," the net deficit resulting from illegal immigrants will be \$75 billion a year, or three-quarters of a trillion over 10 years.

We have no guarantee that these new millions of legalized aliens will not be on the public social programs. Nothing in any of these proposals from these "Gangs" or the White House can convince me otherwise. All told, The Heritage Foundation projects that if that's true, it will mean \$2.5 trillion in new costs to the taxpayers over the next 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that in this time when we are looking for every dollar to save, we should not be giving away the bank at the same time that our borders are not secure and 22 million Americans are out of work. We should be talking about border security first. There should not and cannot be a discussion of amnesty until we secure our borders first.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Ezekiel Pipher, Heartland Evangelical Free Church, Central City, Nebraska, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, by Your sovereign hand, You make all nations, kingdoms, and empires. You raise up their leaders and ordain the rules by which they govern. You alone are righteous in all Your judgments, so it is You that we trust and desire to imitate.

Lord, help the honorable men and women of the House of Representatives

lead by persuasion, kindness, and reason according to Your Scriptures. Equip and guide them to craft laws, resolutions, and amendments that will accomplish Your will for our Nation. By Your Spirit, help them carry out these noble responsibilities with wisdom and integrity. I also ask that You would encourage their families this day.

Our Savior, we eagerly await Your return and Your perfect justice and mercy. Until that moment, grant us patience, and help us be of good courage and strong heart.

We pray in Jesus' name.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ELLISON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND DR. EZEKIEL PIPHER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce Dr. Zeke Pipher, who will serve as our guest chaplain today. Zeke earned his Master of Divinity from Talbot School of Theology and his Doctor of Ministry from Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. He is the senior pastor at Heartland Evangelical Free Church in Central City, Nebraska.

In addition to his work in the ministry, he is an avid outdoorsman and

author. His first book, "Man on the Run: Helping Hyper-Hobbiied Men Recognize the Best Things," was released last year; and he is a regular contributor to several national outdoor magazines. He and his wife, Jamie, have three children and live in central Nebraska.

And, importantly, his favorite football team is the Nebraska Cornhuskers. It is my honor to welcome Dr. Pipher.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS). The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

EPA RELEASES PRODUCERS' INFORMATION TO ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS

(Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the EPA's recent disregard for our Nation's food safety.

Two weeks ago, I learned the EPA released phone numbers, addresses, and even geographic coordinates that were collected from livestock producers. This information was requested by extremist groups, including Earth Justice and the Natural Resources Defense Council, through a Freedom of Information Act request. The EPA handed over the very personal information.

I have serious concerns about the potential threat these actions pose to the privacy of American farm families, as well as the safety and security of our Nation's food supply. This is yet another example of the EPA's overreach into the lives of hardworking individuals in rural America.

As chairman of the Agricultural Subcommittee on Livestock, Rural Development, and Credit, I'm leading a group of 40 House Members in writing a letter to the acting director of the EPA expressing our concern and asking the acting director to ensure the released information is not improperly used.

Mr. Speaker, it is unacceptable for the EPA to do anything that could jeopardize our Nation's food security or threaten our Nation's farm operations.

SEQUESTRATION

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the other day, it became public that Valerie Harper, the star of "Rhoda," was diagnosed with terminal brain cancer. She publicly went forward with that, and it was very touching. I saw her on the morning news when she talked about it. She said that she's doing chemotherapy, she has maybe 3 months—she doesn't know how much—to live, and

she said her husband says that if we can slow this thing down, more stuff may come up.

They're working fast and furiously for all of us. They're not working for Valerie Harper because she played Rhoda, but they're doing this for all cancer patients. And the people that are doing this for all cancer patients—the doctors, the universities, and the scientists—are funded by the National Institutes of Health, all of which will get a 5½ percent cut in their budget because of the sequestration.

This is another example of why it was wrong for us to let the sequestration go into effect and why it's wrong for us not to make cuts that make sense. We need to put more and more dollars for cancer patients, for people with diabetes, people with Alzheimer's, people with AIDS, and people with illnesses that can and will be cured. If they can stay around for a little longer, they can come up with a cure and save people's lives. We don't need to defund or reduce the funding for the National Institutes of Health.

CONGRATULATING DR. MARK EDWARDS, NATIONAL SUPERINTENDENT OF THE YEAR

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. North Carolina's Ninth District is blessed with many wonderful, hardworking educators. Today, I'd like to introduce you to one of them, Dr. Mark Edwards, who was recently named National Superintendent of the Year. Since becoming superintendent of the Mooresville Graded School District in 2007, end-of-grade test scores have soared to the second highest in all of North Carolina, the graduation rate is now the third highest in the State, and Mooresville has become a nationally recognized model for integrating technology into the classroom.

These achievements are even more impressive when you consider that Mooresville has one of the smallest budgets out of the 115 school districts in North Carolina.

Dr. Edwards' work should be a reminder that strong leadership, dedicated teachers, and proactive community involvement are the most important factors in the success of our students, not Washington bureaucrats or programs.

Dr. Edwards, on behalf of the people of North Carolina's Ninth District, congratulations on your national award. May God continue to bless you and your work in Mooresville.

□ 1210

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Congressman RYAN's current budget proposal is a harsh austerity program that seeks to reduce the deficit on the backs of our Nation's most vulnerable while only benefiting the special interests and the Nation's ultrawealthy.

Under this plan, more than 30 million Americans now covered by the Affordable Care Act, including more than 70,000 residents of my district, would be at risk of losing their coverage.

Medicare as we know would cease to exist for more than 5 million future seniors, and over 3.5 million seniors today would lose Medicare preventative care coverage.

This plan also jeopardizes our Nation's economic recovery. The Economic Policy Institute estimates the plan will cost more than 2 million jobs in the next year, reduce the GDP by 1.7 percent, and literally stall the economy through 2017. This is neither the balanced nor rational approach that we need.

I want to work with my colleagues here in the Congress to pass a budget that creates jobs, grows the economy, strengthens the middle class, and responsibly reduces the deficit.

Sadly, this is not that plan.

A CALL FOR JOHN MORTON TO RESIGN

(Mr. ROGERS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, we recently learned that Immigration and Customs Enforcement, also known as ICE, released thousands of illegal immigrants out of our detention facilities across the country in anticipation of the sequester cuts. This was done not after the sequester became law or the cuts became reality, but in anticipation.

This is the latest in a string of lapses in judgment by ICE Director John Morton. Because of his repeated questionable actions, I've called on Mr. Morton to resign.

Rather than making commonsense cuts like reducing administrative staffing, cutting overhead, or taking other action, ICE chose to release thousands of known criminals directly onto our streets and into our communities. ICE's justification for this plan is that those individuals will remain in a monitoring program while deportation proceedings are ongoing. Really?

It baffles me that ICE officials continue to insist that someone who has already committed a crime by entering this country illegally would willingly participate in a monitored self-deportation program.

The sequester has started and across-the-board cuts will affect us all, but we cannot stand by while ICE makes irresponsible decisions. I call on John Morton to resign and make a full accounting of this debacle to the American people.

CONGRATULATING EMMANUEL AVILES

(Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of a very special guest of mine today, Emmanuel Aviles from Taunton, Massachusetts, who is visiting Washington with his family.

At just 10 years old, Emmanuel was selected as the grand-prize winner in Scholastic's national Picture a President art contest. His charcoal sketch of Abraham Lincoln earned him that distinguished honor, as well as a 50-book library for his classroom at Parker Middle School and a trip to Washington, D.C.

Emmanuel's teacher back home calls him, "a great role model," who is "eager to learn and help other kids." He practices art drawing every day and hopes to some day pursue a career in art.

Today, Emmanuel is joined in the Capitol by his father, Emmanuel, Sr., his mother, Karen, and his brother, Diego.

I would like to welcome them to Washington and congratulate Emmanuel on making his school, his city, and his State incredibly proud.

Congratulations, Emmanuel.

OPEN THE PEOPLE'S HOUSE

(Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it was just over a week ago that we learned that the White House is being closed to public tours.

Now the President attempts to justify this decision saying it's a Secret Service decision. I find this disturbingly ironic, coming from a President whose own Web site says that it is his mission to "open up the House to as many people as possible," that he is accepting without objection the decision to prevent the American people from accessing the White House, their house, the people's house.

Even during some of the darkest days of America's history, our 16th President, Abraham Lincoln, championed the policy of true open doors to the White House and governmental transparency. Contrast that with President Obama who is acquiescing to the exact opposite, closing the White House doors to the public.

If the President is unable to help the Secret Service manage an 8.2 percent budget cut and still keep the people's house open, then the American people are entitled to some answers from their Chief Executive.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget released earlier this week will move us in the wrong direction. It promises us growth through austerity, cutting \$943 billion in discretionary spending, but history has proven that it just won't work.

Time and again, we see when an economy is recovering from a recession and it embraces austerity, the economy tumbles. That's what happened in Europe over the past 2 years, that's what happened in Japan in the 1990s, and that's what happened in this country in 1937. We must learn from this lesson.

In fact, experts say that the Republican budget will result in 2 million fewer American jobs and will decrease economic growth by 1.7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, what we have to do is invest in our economy, nation-build here at home in America and in Americans. This is a vehicle for growth. We should not be cutting those kinds of investments.

Austerity is shortsighted, and we should reject it.

STANDING FIRM AGAINST THREATS TO SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS

(Mr. DAINES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, one of the best parts of my job is hearing from the people I serve in the great State of Montana. And while 1 million Montanans offer a lot of different ideas and a lot of different perspectives, there is one concern I hear about every day.

Thousands of Montanans have reached out to my office because they are concerned about recent threats to their Second Amendment rights. Let me be clear: I do not support any efforts that infringe upon Montanans' rights to keep and bear arms. I will continue to stand firm against any proposals that would threaten those rights.

That's why I'm joining Congressman STEVE STOCKMAN and many of my other colleagues in the House in signing a letter to Speaker BOEHNER that makes it clear that we—and the people we represent—are strongly opposed to any efforts that would violate the rights protected by the Second Amendment, and we will reflect that commitment in any vote on legislation that comes before us.

Whether it's so-called "universal background checks" or sweeping bans of firearms owned by thousands of law-abiding Montanans, I will stand firm against any proposal that would threaten Montanans' rights to keep and bear arms.

IN MEMORY OF JUDGE LEONARD WILLIAMS

(Mr. CARNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Judge Leonard Williams, who died recently at age 78.

Judge Williams was one of Delaware's most prominent civil rights leaders and a successful lawyer and judge in Wilmington. Judge Williams spent his life breaking barriers and paving the way for others. Judge Williams was one of the first African American students to integrate the University of Delaware and was the first African American on its football team.

Judge Williams was the longtime law partner of Louis Redding, the Wilmington lawyer who argued Delaware's *Brown v. Board of Education* case before the Supreme Court.

He was a friend and mentor to countless members of our community. Judge Williams was part of the Greatest Generation of African Americans, those who fought the often lonely fight for civil rights and justice, enduring struggle and hardship to make our State and our country a better place for everyone. His presence in the State of Delaware, and particularly in my home city of Wilmington, will be sorely missed.

My thoughts and prayers go out to his family and friends.

□ 1220

A BALANCED BUDGET MEANS JOBS

(Mr. RADEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RADEL. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman, I am the first to make fun of myself and, quite frankly, of both parties. It seems that last session's budget negotiations consisted of Democrats making videos of Republicans throwing your grandmother off a cliff while wonky Republicans would be in the corner, talking about the debt-to-GDP ratio and other things that most hard-working Americans don't have time to think about or understand. But let me tell you what we can all understand: Republicans are doing what Senate Democrats have not done in years—we will pass another budget.

So why does this matter to you?

It matters because a balanced budget means jobs, opportunity and, ultimately, more money in your pocket. More money in Washington means less money for you—less money for your gas, your groceries, your rent, your mortgage, and maybe your next vacation to Florida. Now, being bipartisan, do you know who understood that more than anyone? President Bill Clinton. With a Republican House, the budget was balanced.

We conservatives are working hard to balance that budget today for your opportunity and your job. We are here working for you.

THE RYAN BUDGET

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget, sometimes called the "Ryan budget," also called the "path to prosperity," is really more of the same, more of the same that we've seen for the past 3 years. The only difference is it's worse. The budget is supposed to be the blueprint and is supposed to set forth the philosophy and the policy of the majority; but look at some of the problems. There are many of them, but let's concentrate on seniors. Let's see how it affects them.

The voucher is back. It means Medicare costs are going to rise. There is no closing of the doughnut hole anymore for your prescription drugs because ObamaCare is repealed, and we're going to lose \$810 billion in Medicaid, which is a cut of one-third, two-thirds of which go to the disabled and seniors. The irony is that the majority says it repeals ObamaCare; yet it keeps \$716 billion in Medicare savings and all revenues from ObamaCare for a total of \$1 trillion. So \$2 trillion of its balancing the so-called budget is on the backs of ObamaCare—the ObamaCare that it says it repeals.

This cannot be what this body wants to be identified with—a path to nowhere.

SUPPORTING THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. It's hard for President Obama to find a solution when he doesn't understand the problem.

This week, he told ABC News that he doesn't believe that our country faces a debt crisis. Yesterday, Senate Democrats outlined a budget that never balances but that sinks us further and further into debt year after year.

The American people understand that nearly \$17 trillion of debt is no way to run a country. Hoosiers know that every penny Washington borrows today will be taken from taxpayer pockets tomorrow. Folks back home know this, and so do House Republicans. That's why I am proud to support the budget my friend and colleague Chairman RYAN introduced this week.

Mr. Speaker, this budget actually balances in 10 years—something our Democrat colleagues' budget in the Senate never does. It never balances. Our budget encourages economic growth and promotes opportunity for all Americans. By simplifying the Tax Code, scaling back government overreach and strengthening the promises made to seniors, our budget puts this country on a responsible, balanced path.

I commend Chairman RYAN and the House Budget Committee for their work.

BUDGET PRIORITIES

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is time to debate the budget again, but despite the differences in this Chamber, we could come together and choose to invest in our middle class. We could compromise and responsibly reduce spending while protecting the most vulnerable. We could reach across the aisle and protect the jobs of our teachers and police officers while ending the ludicrous tax loopholes for oil companies.

Instead, we see another case of political gamesmanship. Instead of providing targeted tax cuts to working class families, the Republican budget increases tax breaks for the wealthiest in the country at the expense of middle-income taxpayers, who will pay an average of \$2,000 per family. Instead of solidifying the safety net for our seniors, the Republican budget guts it by turning Medicare into a voucher program. Instead of healing our still fragile housing market, the Republican budget refuses to protect the mortgage interest deduction that our middle class families depend upon.

What we should be doing is working together to put the American Dream back within the reach of our middle class.

IN SUPPORT OF THE SKILLS ACT

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I have made it a priority since day one to support pro-growth, pro-jobs legislation that encourages entrepreneurship and supports innovation—all in the name of strengthening our economy and making certain the United States remains globally competitive and is the place where the hardest working and best minds exist.

To remain competitive, we must continue to have the best trained workforce in the world. Quite often, programs in Washington, D.C., are cumbersome and difficult to use. We must all endeavor to make the Federal Government more efficient and effective.

That's why, today, I rise in approval of the SKILLS Act, and encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense legislation that will eliminate burdensome and frustrating roadblocks that prevent out-of-work Americans from accessing beneficial workforce development programs and job skills training efforts that will only help our national economy.

Mr. Speaker, everyone must have a chance to succeed in our current economy, a chance to realize the American Dream. Let's pass the SKILLS Act so we continue working together in a competitive and thriving economy.

RYAN BUDGET

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Mr. RYAN's budget would cause millions of people to lose access to health care and tens of millions more to lose their jobs.

My question is simple: Why?

I've been here 802 days, and we have not considered a serious jobs bill yet. There are approximately 12 million people unemployed. It's unemployment, not debt, that's at an emergency level. When people lose their jobs, they lose their dignity; they lose their health care and eventually lose their homes.

Shame, shame, shame.

There is only one responsible way to reduce the deficit—get everyone trained, get everyone working, and get everyone contributing to the tax base. People are hurting. People are suffering. They want opportunities. Mr. Speaker, our mantra should be “jobs, jobs, jobs.”

RYAN BUDGET

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget proposal that's soon to be considered by the House.

The policies therein were debated and soundly rejected in the last election. In Las Vegas and across the country, Americans made it clear that our budget should be a path forward for a strong middle class and should be a serious investment in the next generation.

Instead, the Republican budget shrinks investment in infrastructure and education, cuts funding to research and development, eliminates the safety net for our most vulnerable, and ends the Medicare guarantee. Furthermore, it should include a question mark or a giant asterisk because so many aspects of it are vague and so many details are missing. This budget isn't a path to prosperity. It's a collection of inconsistent assumptions and mathematical gimmicks. It's full of phantom revenue and undelineated cuts.

People in my district, District One of Nevada, want Congress to pass a budget that represents a balanced approach, not one based on partisan ideology that's out of touch with their priorities. So I say let's get to work on that.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. I rise today to highlight some of the unique immigration challenges that we face. The good news

is that Washington is finally focused on fixing this very complex issue. Comprehensive reform is crucial to our families, young people, and our economy.

In Hawaii, for example, Filipino families often wait up to 24 years to reunite with their loved ones. We are a community of immigrants—immigrants who came to Hawaii who were seeking greater opportunity, who toiled day in and day out working in our pineapple fields and on our sugar plantations; yet many are still waiting to be reunited with their loved ones. This is unacceptable and unnecessary. It also hurts our economy when small businesses face unnecessary, draconian audits and automatic labeling as fraudulent businesses simply due to their sizes, stifling their ability to grow and create jobs.

We must address these unique immigration issues in Hawaii, across the Pacific, and across the country as part of our national reform legislation in order to reunite families and grow our economy.

□ 1230

REPUBLICAN BUDGET HURTS WOMEN

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, March is Women's History Month, and so I would like to point out that this week the Republicans and Chairman PAUL RYAN once again put forth a budget that hurts women and fails to meet the moral code of our Nation. There is no morality in a budget that takes food from the mouths of struggling women and children while slashing taxes for millionaires and billionaires. These attacks on breast cancer research, on child care, on affordable health insurance for families, on maternal health and education are not what we owe our mothers, our sisters, and our daughters. Make no mistake: women, especially poor women, will shoulder the burden of these cuts.

At a time when so many Americans are struggling just to make ends meet, we must do more, not less, to provide a strong safety net for all Americans. I call on my colleagues to support a budget that provides compassion of the government to help American women in need and invests in the future that they deserve.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET IS CYNICAL DOCUMENT

(Mr. HINOJOSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, while I recognize that this Republican budget is just a political document that will never become law, I am still disappointed at what a cynical, cruel, and

dishonest document it is. It is cynical because it repeals the protections and benefits of the Affordable Care Act while keeping in place all of the cost savings in order to pay for another tax cut for millionaires. It's cruel because it would gut Medicaid, a program designed to protect our most vulnerable seniors from sickness and death, by over \$800 billion. This budget would slash Pell Grants for students, food assistance for needy families, and the Head Start school program for children.

Most of all, it's simply a dishonest document. My Republican friends claim that their budget will cut taxes and balance the budget. They say they will pay for all of it with trillions of dollars in savings from closing tax loopholes, but the budget conveniently refuses to name any of them.

Mr. Speaker, we should reject this budget and its displaced priorities. I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic alternative, which presents a balanced way to bringing down our deficit that doesn't leave our seniors at risk.

OPPOSING THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republican budget proposal. This plan hurts the middle class, repeals health care for millions of Americans, and does nothing to guarantee seniors the benefits they earned and have been promised.

The Republican budget plan introduced this week offers no new, real solutions. This is the third time this plan has been introduced, even though the country clearly rejected it this past November. Congress needs to listen to the American people and work together on responsible, long-term solutions.

The House Republican plan has devastating consequences for seniors, our parents, and our grandparents. The Republican budget turns Medicare into an extensive private insurance program for seniors. Our country made a commitment to care for our parents and grandparents, and it's important that we uphold that commitment. Let's not forget that one day our kids will grow older and will depend on these vital programs. We need to balance our budget and reduce the deficit, but we must not do so on the backs of our middle class and our seniors.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1545

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

MARCH 14, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 5(a)(4)(A) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I designate the following Members to be available to serve on Investigative Subcommittees of the Committee on Ethics during the 113th Congress:

John C. Carney of Delaware, Gerald E. Connolly of Virginia, Janice Hahn of California, Brian Higgins of New York, Hakeem S. Jeffries of New York, William R. Keating of Massachusetts, Ed Perlmutter of Colorado, Terri A. Sewell of Alabama, Jackie Speier of California, Dina Titus of Nevada.

Best regards,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 803, SUPPORTING KNOWLEDGE
AND INVESTING IN LIFE-
LONG SKILLS ACT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 113 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 113

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 803) to reform and strengthen the workforce investment system of the Nation to put Americans back to work and make the United States more competitive in the 21st century. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-4. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee

on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1550

Ms. FOXX. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During the consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. House Resolution 113 provides for a structured rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 803, the Supporting Knowledge and Investing in Lifelong Skills Act, also known simply as the SKILLS Act.

Mr. Speaker, today, the House will consider the SKILLS Act, which reauthorizes the Workforce Investment Act, WIA, of 1998. While these programs have continued to receive funding through the appropriations process, the WIA authorization expired in 2003.

WIA seeks to coordinate local employment services through a unified workforce development service and a one-stop career center delivery system. Reforming the Nation's workforce development system is critical, and in these difficult economic times, when roughly 20 million Americans are struggling to find adequate work, we cannot afford to delay action any longer. Delay is costly for those seeking to find work. Today, many unemployed and underemployed Americans have turned to Federal workforce education programs to develop the skills they need to be competitive for jobs, but instead of an easy-to-navigate, responsive system, many have found a complex bureaucracy unresponsive to their needs and concerns.

In January 2011, the Government Accountability Office, the GAO, identified 47 separate and distinct workforce development programs across nine different Federal agencies that cost taxpayers approximately \$18 billion annually. The GAO report found that almost all of these programs were duplicative and overlapping, that only five of these programs had had any type of evaluation, and that those evaluations had not been very effective ones.

Through the Education and the Workforce Committee's oversight of the WIA system, even more programs have been identified, and the true number of Federal workforce development programs is greater than 50. We know this is a problem, and we all agree this needs to change. President Obama recognized the challenge of the current bureaucratic system in his 2012 State of the Union address. Let me quote the President directly:

I want to cut through the maze of confusing training programs so that, from now on, people have one program, one place to go, for all the information and help that they need.

These are among the many reasons I introduced the SKILLS Act earlier this year. This legislation streamlines 35 duplicative Federal workforce development programs, and it creates a single workforce investment fund to serve employers, workers, and job seekers.

The SKILLS Act establishes a dynamic, employer-driven workforce development system by ensuring that two-thirds of the State and local Workforce Investment Boards' members are employers, and it repeals 19 federally mandated board positions. This legislation expands decisionmaking at State and local levels so that these individuals can make the best decisions to meet the needs of their communities.

The bill also addresses the administrative bloat in Washington by requiring the Office of Management and Budget to identify and reduce the number of Federal staff working on employment workforce development programs that will be consolidated under this bill. The SKILLS Act holds these programs accountable for taxpayer dollars spent by requiring annual performance evaluations and by establishing common performance metrics.

The bill also allows States to determine eligible training providers, simplifying the bureaucratic process that has forced many community colleges and other providers out of the system, and it gives local boards the flexibility to work directly with community colleges to educate large groups of participants. Additionally, the SKILLS Act encourages these programs to focus on in-demand jobs and industries so that participants will be able to succeed in the workplace upon completion, and it ensures that funds are spent directly on services rather than on administration and bureaucrats. This bill improves transparency by requiring States and local areas to report annually on administrative costs.

Each day we delay is another day employers are not hiring the workers they need, another day unemployed workers are not receiving the best technical education and another day taxpayer dollars are wasted on red tape and well-intentioned but broken programs. We have a responsibility to move this process forward. The time to act is now.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, the Supporting Knowledge and Investing in Lifelong Skills, or SKILLS Act.

For the last 40 years, the reauthorization of the Federal job training legislation has had the support of Democrats and Republicans. Members on both sides of the aisle know that the passage of this bill is critical to our Nation's recovery and future competitiveness.

I served on the State Board of Education in Colorado from 2000 to 2006, and I recall the prior authorization of the Workforce Investment Act that we're still operating under. It dates to 1998. It came up after 5 years, which was in 2003, and I remember being on the State board. In our State, like in many States, jurisdiction goes between both the Department of Labor and the State Department of Education. Under the State Department of Education, we have some of the adult literacy components and adult education components of workforce investment, and under the Department of Labor, we have other areas of responsibility.

We said, well, hopefully, Congress will act. That was in 2003–2004, but that Congress didn't act. We said, well, hopefully, Congress will act in 2005–2006. We still need a reauthorization, so let's hope Congress will act. Then I ran for Congress. I was in the next Congress from 2009–2010 with a Democratic majority. It didn't pass. In 2011–2012, with a Republican majority, there was no WIA reauthorization.

So here we are now in the 113th Congress, and, unfortunately, we have a bill that lacks bipartisan support. Unfortunately, the Republicans have departed from the long history of bipartisanship in common areas of agreement, some of which were talked about by Dr. Foxx in her opening remarks: streamlining programs; reducing the number of programs that have been shown to be ineffective by the GAO; having a workforce investment system that's more nimble and able to react to changes in the economy, to changes in the employment sector, to changes in the types of skills that people need to succeed in the 21st century workforce. Unfortunately, we have a bill today which falls short in that regard.

Even though this bill gives great authority to Governors, I have word from my own home State's Department of

Labor and Unemployment of its opposition to this bill. We have statements from many other disability advocates, youth groups, civil rights groups that are opposed to this bill. Workers with disabilities, disadvantaged youth, returning veterans, low-income adults, migrant workers, and minorities are all underserved populations that a workforce investment system is designed to serve, yet these are the very populations that stand to lose the most under the current bill.

Instead of encouraging collaboration between these programs and streamlining these programs and rewarding what works and stopping what doesn't work, this bill forces effective programs to compete with one another for State funding, putting an additional burden on State and local budgets in the process. Instead of prioritizing incentives for business, which could potentially leverage our Federal investment for colleges and local governments and workforce organizations to collaborate, this bill requires that only employers be represented on Workforce Investment Boards, leaving many other stakeholders on the sidelines.

Of course, meeting the needs of employers is the goal of the Workforce Investment Act, but when you look at the stakeholders that will deliver on that and match the people to the skills, you need to include businesses, colleges, local governments, and others who work in partnership with needs assessment, driven by the employment needs of the private sector, to help determine the outputs that are important for workforce training systems so that our economy can continue to grow and succeed.

Mr. Speaker, this bill hands a blank check to Governors with a message that says to go ahead and use Federal tax dollars however you like, you can eliminate services for the underserved, and yet we, the American taxpayers, are continuing to pay for it.

Look, we are custodians of taxpayer trust here in this body. Frequently, this body doesn't do a very good job of that with the deficits that we have, with the lack of any comprehensive way of reining in Federal spending and even with regard to the sequester, which, while it makes progress on reining in Federal spending, it does so in a non-discriminate way rather than with a thoughtful approach that would be in the interest of our country. Here we are just passing out dollar bills, throwing dollar bills to the States. Here comes Uncle Sam, ready to bail out Governors. They're playing the walnut game—moving it over to this account and moving it to this account.

□ 1600

This is essentially a slush fund for State Governors, as it's currently constructed, at the expense of groups that traditionally have high unemployment, including veterans who so capably served our country, particularly during our two most recent wars—the Iraq

War, which has wound down, and the Afghanistan war, which we hope winds down over the next couple of years—as well as the many veterans of prior conflicts, including the first Gulf War and the Vietnam conflict, who continue to suffer from unemployment at above average levels to this day.

In addition, this bill decreases the WIA State set-aside funding that facilitates targeted innovation and encourages interstate partnerships. My home State of Colorado has used this funding for a State energy sector partnership, provided scholarships to train over 20 Coloradans. It led to full-time employment, even leading to the creation of a new company.

This funding also allowed Colorado to form 10 strategy sector partnerships, which have leveraged more than three-quarters of a million in private financing and public financing towards incentives that will train over 1,200 Colorado job seekers in high-demand occupations. This vital funding would be slashed from 15 percent to 5 percent. I would add that, under the Democratic substitute, which we are grateful that this rule allows for, WIA State set-aside would be restored at the full 15 percent.

In addition, this bill would freeze authorized funding levels for WIA over the next 7 years. This freeze comes on top of the fact that WIA funding has already been cut in half since 2001. Let me say that again. WIA funding has been cut in half since 2001, at the very time when the changing needs of the global economy need to be matched so that Americans can keep up with the skills they need to compete in the 21st century economy. And while making a cut there could save a few dollars now, if we fail to invest in the future of bringing Americans along to ensure that they can have good jobs that our Nation depends on, this would have a profound negative impact on our budget and economy over time.

There are many ideas that a number of us have had to make this bill better. Many of them are included in the Democratic substitute, which is allowed under this rule and will be debated with extended debate time and discussed. However, many of us would have preferred an open rule. We proposed an open rule yesterday in the Rules Committee. Had an open rule been offered, I would have loved to bring forth a number of amendments, including one that is a bill I cosponsor with Representative ROSA DELAURIO of Connecticut that would make it easier for women to get training in jobs that they are capable of doing in fields that they are traditionally underrepresented in. There are many fields, while women have made great progress across the economy, where women only have a 2 or 3 or 4 percent presence that are high-paying jobs. We need to match women to the skills so they can fulfill those opportunities.

I also would like to see, if there had been an open process here on the floor

of the House of Representatives, a requirement that State and local workforce organizations both give some of their time and effort on promoting training to empower people to start their own companies through entrepreneurship and innovation. In addition to creating access to entrepreneurship training, we can focus on reducing the skills gap in computer science and information technology, fast-growing occupations, by providing education and training for the jobs of their future.

Democrats have introduced their own workforce reauthorization bill, the Workforce Investment Act of 2013, which would streamline programs, maintain strong protections for veterans and other vulnerable populations, and create stronger accountability for employment outcomes while recognizing and expanding the central role community colleges play in job training.

Again, I'm pleased that this rule makes the Democratic substitute in order. I wish that it was an open rule that allowed for a full discussion of the many ideas that come from the entire body of membership.

It will take both sides working together on this bill, with Dr. FOXX's effort, Ranking Member MILLER's effort, Chairman KLINE's effort, Ranking Member HINOJOSA's effort, to create a reauthorization that will stand the test of time, replacing the 1998 law that we all continue to operate under in a world that has changed significantly since then.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the comments of my colleague from Colorado, as he's on the Education Committee. And I certainly wish that he and his colleagues had stayed in the Education Committee markup on this bill and offered the many ideas he said that they had to make it better; but, unfortunately, they walked out and did not take the opportunity to offer those amendments in the committee.

I would now like to yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to show my support in favor of the workforce initiative bill presented by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

This bill is not restrictive to any group, be it gender or race, but is for all Americans. This bill will allow people to find gainful employment in the marketplace. This is what America is in dire need of right now, and that is jobs.

By helping people acquire the skills needed to find employment, we also give them the ability to help themselves in their ability to change their lifestyle as they pursue their American Dream.

The SKILLS Act will help the economy in several ways:

One, by creating a more qualified workforce to fill the needs of today's industries. Thus, it will bring more certainty to the marketplace. Therefore, employers, knowing that there is a more readily available trained workforce, will be more likely to expand their business.

Another way is it will create higher paying jobs.

A third way is it reduces the number of administrative agencies that oversee and run these programs by more than half, thereby causing government to be more streamlined, operate more efficiently, and save the taxpayers money.

The end result, we help people get back to work sooner; and by doing so, we make a stronger America. So many of our policies of the past, although well-intentioned, have held people back and kept them out of the workforce by not promoting the learning or the advanced job skills needed in today's work environment. I believe we all would prefer to see people independent and self-sufficient versus dependent upon government.

America is known as a generous country, and let's work to keep her that way; but America is also known as the land of opportunity for those that choose to seize that opportunity. This SKILLS Act will help ensure people acquire the skills, and if they desire to take advantage of the opportunity, to succeed in America. Again, everyone wins and America is stronger.

For these reasons, we should move forward with this legislation; and I urge my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, to vote in favor of the rule.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the ongoing problem with this Republican majority is their insistence on partisan political ploys at the expense of sound policy. It's their way or the highway, and this is a good example. This bill should be a bipartisan bill. This bill should have brought both sides together for the common goal of putting people back to work.

The bill we are considering today, the so-called SKILLS Act, doesn't in any way, shape, or form reflect bipartisanship. Instead of bringing a bill to the floor that will help our economy prosper and grow jobs, instead of bringing a bill to the floor where there's bipartisanship, this majority has given us a bill that, quite frankly, will gut job training programs.

This is not a good bill. In fact, it does real harm to job training programs that will help put Americans back to work. And I'm particularly alarmed by the bill's egregious cuts to the SNAP Education and Training program.

The SKILLS Act would destroy the SNAP Education and Training program as we know it. It would kill a program that provides low-income individuals

with the training they need to get jobs, jobs that pay enough to get them off of public assistance. And here is the deal: the SNAP Education and Training program works; it actually works.

The author of this bill, my colleague on the Rules Committee, Dr. FOXX, does not take a meat-ax to this program but, instead, cleverly reworks it in a way so that, while it will exist in name, it will not be able to carry out its mission. Rather than going directly at the program and reducing or zeroing out the program funding, the bill instead eliminates the role of the SNAP agency in determining what kinds of services are provided to SNAP participants.

Under its SKILLS Act, the WIA board is authorized to serve "eligible SNAP participants." The way this would appear to work is that the State SNAP agency would still assign some group of participants to SNAP Education and Training programs, but only to those programs as provided through WIA.

□ 1610

And here's the concern: the concern is that a good number of States, including my home State of Massachusetts, have found the WIA services to be inappropriate for SNAP recipients.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, childless, unemployed adults generally cannot participate in SNAP for more than 3 months out of every 3 years unless they are enrolled in certain types of training programs for 20 hours per week.

In this legislation, workforce investment boards are not required to provide work slots that meet these conditions, and State SNAP agencies are no longer able to provide additional services. As a result, if jobs are not available, some poor individuals who are willing to work could lose their SNAP benefits. They could lose their food benefits.

According to the Government Accountability Office:

Many SNAP participants are not ready for many program services such as training classes offered by programs at the WIA one-stops because they lack basic skills, such as reading and computer literacy, that would allow them to use their services successfully.

At best, Mr. Speaker, low-income individuals on SNAP who are lacking job skills that will help them get off public assistance will be denied access to job-training programs. But here's the kicker: at worst, low-income individuals who rely on SNAP to put food on their table will either see part or all of their benefit cut.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, just when you think things couldn't get worse for poor people in this country, this new legislation could actually make hunger worse.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill that does nothing to help the American economy or the unemployed or the untrained in this country. We should be focusing on jobs, not partisan legislation.

This is an area where we should be able to come together, as my colleague, Mr. POLIS, said. This is yet another attack on poor people. We should be working to end hunger now and not passing bills that make hunger worse.

I'll conclude as I began, Mr. Speaker, by saying that this is one of those opportunities that I think the American people believe that we could come together. Unfortunately, this has become a partisan ploy, another partisan press release.

This bill is going nowhere, and I regret that very much because unemployed people need help.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am used to hyperbole on this floor. I'm used to hyperbole from my colleague from Massachusetts, but I really think this one was a little over the top.

This bill does not kill the employment program with SNAP, and only 6.8 percent of the recipients of food stamps even participate in that program. So to say that this bill is going to create additional hunger in this country is really over the top a little bit.

The best way we can help people who are hungry in this country is to help them get a good-paying job, and that's what we need to be doing.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding, as well as her sponsorship of this important bill.

You know, job creation and getting Americans back to work is the number one priority facing this country. And in talking to people from my district, talking to people who are unemployed, people who are underemployed, they tell me that they need skills to get back to work.

We need workforce development programs that work. We need to train people for jobs that are here today and jobs that are going to be here tomorrow.

One step we can take is to reform our workforce development program. Our system currently isn't flexible. It has too much red tape, and we need to make sure it works for people who are looking for jobs and connects people who are looking for jobs with employers that have open positions.

We need a nimble system that can respond to our changing economy, and we have to streamline our current system. Today we have at least 47 duplicate or ineffective programs. We need a simpler, more comprehensive system, a system that employers and job seekers can navigate and successfully complete.

The SKILLS Act will address these issues and set up a workforce development program that will train people looking for jobs to get them back to work. That's why I look forward to voting in favor of the SKILLS Act.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Colorado, and I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill of the so-called SKILLS Act.

Fifteen years ago, before I was in Congress, I watched with great interest as Congress, House and Senate, Democrat and Republican, worked on worker training and produced the Workforce Investment Act. I was impressed. This was the kind of thing that Congress should be doing. It was the kind of thing that made me look forward to the prospect of maybe going to Congress some day.

I remember David Broder, then the dean of Washington journalists, wrote a column saying this is exactly the kind of thing that Congress should be doing—and they were doing it in a bipartisan way.

And here we are today, 15 years later, with an ideological, partisan dead end.

Now, let me make it clear: workforce investment is what Congress needs to do. The government plays an important role in training and fostering a strong and capable workforce.

The so-called SKILLS Act does not invest in the workforce. Rather, it seeks to combine and reduce vital programs that workers need.

As a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I, along with others, sought to help to develop and update an efficient, fair program that would help eager workers get the right training and get the right jobs. We had some good ideas to contribute. Some of them had been tested in my home State of New Jersey.

We had some strong evidence that some of the programs that Representative FOXX's version had canceled, or sought to cancel, should be improved and retained. We had good legislative language for the majority party to consider, and we were rebuffed. Our efforts were in vain.

American workers are now caught in the middle of this partisan, ideological effort. Individuals with disabilities, the disadvantaged, high-risk youth, veterans cannot afford to be abandoned by the majority party's proposal.

It was interesting that the author of this bill said, well, only 6.8 percent of the SNAP participants use the workforce training. Oh, so 3 million people we can forget about. Is that the implication of that?

No, I think the implication should be we should expand it to even more. We need to work together to provide our Nation's job seekers with the resources and the training they need to obtain and maintain quality employment. The underlying partisan "consolidate it and then cut it bill" will keep people out of work, not put them back to work.

I urge the defeat of the rule so that we can have something more bipartisan, and I urge defeat of the bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of a line from "The Canterbury Tales": The gentleman doth protest too much.

We're told that this is a partisan bill, that the efforts of the other side were in vain.

Well, let me remind my colleague, he's one of the members of the committee that walked out of the committee meeting. When there was the opportunity for the Democrats to offer amendments, they did not do it. However, some amendments were offered before the Rules Committee, and we have all of the amendments that were submitted by the Democrats and not withdrawn that are going to be considered today.

The Democrat substitute amendment was made in order, and I appreciate Mr. POLIS acknowledging that. And we've given them extended debate time. So it's not exactly as though we are shutting them out of this process.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, Congresswoman ELLMERS.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, thank you to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, whose passion and longstanding experience in this area have brought this great piece of legislation for us to be able to vote on today.

And I would just like to rise and say that I am in support of the rule and the underlying bill to the SKILLS Act.

□ 1620

Here in Congress we frequently hear from our constituents back home that we need to work with the President on many issues, and this is a perfect example of a piece of legislation that we are working on with President Barack Obama. The SKILLS Act directly addresses what the President recently called "a maze of confusing training programs."

This is our chance to come together and create meaningful, commonsense reform that will help struggling Americans pull themselves up out of unemployment and empower them to better provide for their families. It would also create a single Workforce Investment Fund. It basically streamlines numerous ineffective, redundant programs, and it allows for every American to better themselves.

I can only think of whom this bill actually helps. I can think of the single mother who is working every day and wants to better help her family and have the flexibility to go back to school to our good community colleges in this country, to our technical schools. This bill cuts the red tape that our community colleges and our technical schools now face. And now we can help them. There are so many out there that need this help.

Mr. Speaker, this idea is not Republican and it is not Democrat. It is common sense. In fact, this bill is largely the same bill that came out of the Education and Workforce Committee last Congress, and most of the Democratic provisions have been retained.

I am also hearing from constituents back home. For instance, Dr. Larry Keen, president of Fayetteville Technical Community College, recently told my office:

I am in favor of the SKILLS Act and the purposes for which it was created. Anything that contributes to the simplification of a very complex system is of value.

Again, I rise today in support of this. I agree with Dr. Keen. I am here to say that I am calling on my colleagues to step away from this partisan attack and help us pass this bill. Additionally, I hope the Senate will do the same.

Mr. POLIS. I have to take a moment to correct the gentlelady from North Carolina, my colleague, Dr. FOXX, who quoted, "The lady doth protest too much," saying it was from Canterbury Tales. It is actually from Shakespeare's Hamlet. I'm sure the gentlelady, upon further reflection, will concur.

I will add this bill, like Hamlet, is indeed a tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 803, the SKILLS Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is the time to be investing in workforce development programs, not slashing them. I especially want to point out that unemployment in Rhode Island remains unacceptably high, yet the skills gap is an employment obstacle we can overcome with the right resources. Workers need proper training to succeed in a global economy, and the Workforce Investment Act programs have helped to do just that.

So it saddens me that the bill before us today cuts so many vital programs just when we need them the most. It freezes investments in job training. It cuts or consolidates 35 critical programs and limits access to services for youth, minorities, older workers, people with disabilities, and veterans—the vulnerable populations that this law was designed to serve.

This bill could also imperil the efforts of organizations making positive strides also in my home State. A prime example of this is the Genesis Adult Education Center in Providence, which receives 20 percent of its total budget from WIA sources and helps some of the most disadvantaged people in our State through job training, child care, and support services. Under the SKILLS Act, the Genesis Center could face a reduction of funding and would be forced to serve fewer Rhode Islanders.

At the Job Corps centers nationwide, enrollment of new students has been suspended, and this bill does nothing to address this problem. For almost 3 years, the Job Corps center in Rhode Island has been unable to enroll new students in job training classes. We should be considering legislation that addresses this challenge and invests in job creation, and this bill falls far short on both counts.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and reject this bill so that we can come together in a bipartisan manner that properly addresses our workforce issues.

Ms. FOXX. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I thank her for her leadership on this very, very important issue.

As I travel across Virginia's Fifth District, it is clear that years of failed policies—like the President's health care law, higher taxes, and stimulus spending—have impacted the people that I represent. Main Streets all across our rural district have seen our small businesses struggle. Families across our district have felt the pain as neighbors, friends, and family members have lost their jobs and tried to find work.

As our economy struggles, ensuring our unemployed and underemployed have access to the skills training that they need to improve their careers is as important as ever. However, the Federal Government workforce training programs, while well intended, are cluttered with bureaucracy, waste, and inefficiency. They're not helping those they were intended to help. Americans will not benefit from these programs until we ensure that they are both efficient and effective.

At a time when the national debt is skyrocketing, a 2011 study from the GAO found that taxpayers are spending \$18 billion on 47 duplicative job training programs across nine Federal agencies. Our top priority in the House of Representatives over the last 2 years has been getting Americans out of the unemployment lines and into good-paying jobs. And today we are standing up to make those critical reforms.

By adopting the SKILLS Act, Congress will put words into action and take a critical step toward getting our communities back to work. This legislation will eliminate red tape that prevents workers from accessing job training, and it will ensure that support is tailored to the specific needs of individual workers.

A strong workforce is critical to this Nation. I remain committed to getting Virginia's Fifth District back to work. I urge my colleagues to support me in supporting the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague from California for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule and to the underlying bill. At a time when more and more people are starting their own businesses, we should be doing everything we can to encourage entrepreneurship. Unfortunately, current rules make it difficult for Workforce Investment Boards, or WIBs as we call them, to provide entrepreneurial training services or to count the suc-

cesses of those programs in their outcome measures, the very thing that we ought to be doing through these Workforce Investment Boards. As a result, very few WIBs even offer these programs, depriving aspiring entrepreneurs of valuable resources to help them thrive.

That's why in the last Congress I introduced legislation to fix the guidelines for self-employment training. Our goal would make it easier for Workforce Investment Boards to offer these programs in the local community and expand access to training for aspiring entrepreneurs.

I would like to thank Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. MILLER for including my legislation in their amendment that will be considered tomorrow. Job training and reemployment issues always have been, and always should be, bipartisan. So it's very sad that this rule and the underlying bill have come to the floor under a strictly partisan process and that they will actually harm the very programs that they're designed to support.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Ms. FOXX. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Indiana, a member of the Education and Workforce Committee, Mrs. BROOKS.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. I would first like to thank the leadership of Congresswoman FOXX.

I stand here today not just as a Member of Congress but as a former community college administrator. As senior vice president and general counsel for Indiana's largest public college system, I led statewide workforce education and training efforts aimed at putting thousands of Hoosiers back to work. I also served on Indiana's State Workforce Board, which administers the funds set forth in the SKILLS Act.

My experience in the workforce development arena taught me a very important lesson: Americans of all ages and backgrounds have the ability to be anything they want to be, but they need a flexible support system that prioritizes people and not bureaucracy.

This is bureaucracy and this is what our current system looks like. That's why Congress must pass the SKILLS Act. We have a chance to empower millions of individuals to lead more fulfilling lives by finding meaningful work, and we must take that chance now. This is the time to choose people over paperwork and workers over waste.

□ 1630

My own district is home to several global manufacturing and life science leaders. I recently sat down with employees from Dow AgroSciences, headquartered in Zionsville, Indiana. One by one, its employees told me we have to make better, smarter investment decisions in workforce development and education for our Nation to succeed and for our companies to succeed.

How can we be a Nation that spends over \$18 billion a year on job training

programs—over 47 job training programs—and yet have almost 3.6 million jobs going unfilled? So we have jobs that are unfilled because we have a system that doesn't work. This isn't good enough for America. We can do better, and the SKILLS Act can take us on that path.

The SKILLS Act can and will put people back to work. It is leaner. It provides a roadmap for success that can fuel a 21st century workforce. It removes roadblocks that prevent workers from receiving in-demand training, and it gives local leaders the flexibility to provide more funding to high-performing programs. Every step of the way, it ensures more of every dollar we spend goes to training people rather than to the government bureaucracy administering all of the 47 different programs today.

House Republicans are ready to show we can put skilled American workers over government bureaucracy by passing the SKILLS Act. I support passage of this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. POLIS. I'd like to inquire of the gentlelady from North Carolina if she has any remaining speakers.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we do have additional speakers.

Mr. POLIS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to now yield 3 minutes to another distinguished colleague from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina. Thank you for your hard work on this very important bill.

I rise today in support of the rule to H.R. 803, the SKILLS Act. This critically important legislation, introduced by Dr. Foxx, will reform and strengthen our Nation's workforce investment system.

Back where I come from in Indiana's Sixth Congressional District, the number one issue is jobs. Though there are 12 million Americans looking for work, most folks would be surprised to know that 3.6 million jobs are unfilled simply because prospective employees lack the necessary knowledge and training needed for that job. The SKILLS Act works to address this problem.

Folks in my district are tired of the failed Obama economy. Too many times parents have had to come home and tell their children that they've lost their job and they don't know how they're going to pay their bills, or send them to college, or get their car fixed. Too many times in recent years young people have been unable to find a job—or at least find a good-paying job that lets them start their journey of life.

Unfortunately, our Nation's job-training system has been failing these hardworking taxpayers. The more than 50 separate programs offered under the current system costs taxpayers \$18 billion annually. Most of these programs are duplicative and not as effective as they should be. This has led to taxpayer dollars being wasted, employers

being unable to hire adequately trained workers, and workers not getting the skills they need to succeed.

We must do better. The SKILLS Act will eliminate and streamline 35 ineffective and redundant programs to ensure workers are getting the skills they need to fill available jobs. The SKILLS Act will eliminate wasteful duplication and empower State leaders, local elected officials, and job creators to make the necessary decisions to ensure workers receive training for jobs in high demand. This bill will guarantee job creators a stronger role in workforce development decisions and ensure taxpayer dollars aren't wasted on broken bureaucracies. Most importantly, these changes will help workers find good-paying jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the SKILLS Act strengthens our workforce investment system, provides smart stewardship of taxpayer dollars, and gives us the opportunity to do better right now. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. POLIS. I'd like to inquire of the gentlelady from North Carolina if she has any remaining speakers.

Ms. FOXX. Yes, we do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. POLIS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have continued to malign what they call a "political process." Regular order, Mr. Speaker, is not political process.

The SKILLS Act has been posted online for nearly a month. The Higher Education and Workforce Training Subcommittee held a legislative hearing on this bill on February 26, and a full committee markup last Thursday. Unfortunately, the Democrats opposed the open transparent process of markup and instead requested that members of the committee hold closed-door negotiations. During the markup, the Democrats ultimately walked out and refused even to offer amendments. This is not what the American people asked for in the 2012 elections. They asked us to work together in a transparent, bipartisan way to address our country's challenges, and we gave our colleagues that opportunity. They refused it.

Last year, the committee accepted four Democrat amendments during consideration of the Workforce Investment Improvement Act, the predecessor of the SKILLS Act. These four amendments are retained in the base text of the SKILLS Act, hardly a partisan approach.

My Republican colleagues and I on the Education Committee have shown we're willing and ready to work with our Democrat colleagues, and it's unfortunate that they instead chose a partisan walkout.

In contrast, under Democrat control in the 110th and 111th Congresses, the House considered 66 bills that were referred to the Education and Workforce Committee, but received no committee consideration before being brought to the House floor.

The SKILLS Act has gone through an open and transparent process, and it is unfortunate that Democrats have been unwilling to participate in regular committee process.

Additionally, the rule before us today provides consideration of six amendments, including all amendments submitted to the Rules Committee by Democrats that were not withdrawn before the Rules Committee hearing. As I stated before, the Democrat substitute amendment was made in order with extended debate time. This exceedingly fair rule is a culmination of a transparent, regular order which allows my colleagues across the aisle multiple opportunities to argue for their approach.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Again, I'd like to inquire of the gentlelady if she has any remaining speakers.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, it appears now that we do not have any additional speakers, and if the gentleman from Colorado is prepared to close, I will also be prepared.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, particularly at a time of economic stagnation, recovery from a recession, skills are a more important piece than ever to ensure that Americans can compete in the 21st century workforce.

We all know that many of the jobs that helped Americans earn a solid place in the middle class in the 20th century are not necessarily going to be the same jobs that will allow Americans to live in upwardly mobile middle class lifestyle in the 21st century. There are new growth sectors, new opportunities, and yes, new challenges as well.

One of the keys to both our prosperity as a Nation as well as the prosperity and growth of the middle class is to make sure that Americans have the skills they need to compete in the 21st century economy. When we match those skills to the people who need to have them to support their families, we're talking about all American families. We're talking about veterans. We're talking about the disabled. We're talking about those who don't have a high school diploma. We're talking about immigrants.

□ 1640

We need to make sure that each of these groups that traditionally has had and does have a higher unemployment rate than Americans as a whole can receive the type of training, education, and skills that they need to support their families and give back to the rest of us—a hand up, rather than a hand out. That is what workforce investment is all about.

Both Democrats and Republicans agree it's long overdue for us to update and strengthen the Workforce Investment Act. It was written in 1998. The world was different in 1998. I don't

think any of us saw the degree with which the economy would change. We've, since 1998, had many new technology jobs, the Internet has grown to a mainstream phenomenon, we've had a banking crisis, we've had two wars, and we're on our third President since 1998. Things have changed a lot. Things have changed a lot.

I'm amazed, Mr. Speaker, when I meet people now that were born in the 1990s and they're in the workforce. It's absolutely incredible to think about. And, yet, we're still operating under a law that doesn't reflect the changing needs of the American workforce. It is time for Democrats and Republicans to work together—to work together—to reauthorize the Workforce Investment Act.

The President has stated that he doesn't support this bill, he wouldn't sign this bill. We need to work together, Democrats and Republicans, to come up with a framework that works. Yes, we all know that a committee markup process is part of that process; but so, too, is establishing the base bill, a process from which Democrats were excluded.

Former Education and Workforce Committee Chairman BUCK MCKEON said that he “would like to see us work in that same mode where we really try to work together. I don't think it is the Republican bill or the Democratic bill, but it should be all of our bill.”

Unfortunately, with regards to where this bill is today, Republicans did not choose to regard this wise advice of the former chairman in how this bill was formed and brought to the floor. Now, again, while neither House Democrats or committee Democrats or the President support the underlying bill, I'm hopeful that the Republican leadership's desire to move this bill to the floor indicates the start of a process to finally reauthorize the Workforce Investment Act.

It's not an issue of left or right. It's an issue of updating the Workforce Investment Act to reflect the changing needs of our economy and the changing set of skills that Americans need to support themselves.

I'm hopeful that with the continued work of Dr. FOXX, Chairman KLINE, Ranking Member MILLER, Ranking Member HINOJOSA, and other esteemed Members of this body that Republicans and Democrats will work together both making concessions to improve the Nation's workforce investment system and improve the route to the middle class for working families across our country.

Workforce investment and training to address the skills gap are critical to this economy as a whole. We have a long way to go to strengthen and, yes, streamline our workforce training and investment programs. There are some good ideas with regards to streamlining workforce investment that are contained in this bill that can form a basis for bipartisan support, but we still have a long way to go. We need to

work across the aisle to invest in our future and take care of fellow citizens to make sure that they have the ability to support themselves.

I look forward to continuing this process with Members on both sides of the aisle, with members of the committee and Members of the House at large. Yet the process and bill before us currently is flawed.

Therefore, I urge a “no” vote on this rule and the underlying bill. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The world has changed greatly since 1998 when this legislation was first authorized and even since 2003 when this legislation was last reauthorized.

I'm very concerned that my colleague has said that this legislation is flawed and that we did not participate or provide a bipartisan process. This is an example of Democrats blaming Republicans for what they themselves do. We gave our colleagues every opportunity to come help fix the flaws in this legislation through regular order. They chose not to do it.

The President said in his 2012 State of the Union Address:

It is time to turn our employment system into a reemployment system that puts people to work.

With 12 million Americans looking for work, the SKILLS Act makes commonsense reforms to a broken workforce development system to remove inefficiencies and ensure that individuals are able to get the education skills they need to find a job.

Now the President is saying that he will veto this legislation, and yet it does exactly what he asked us to do. This is another example of the President saying one thing and doing another.

The SKILLS Act takes a crucial step forward in the fight to eliminate red tape and create a more effective system to better serve and prepare Americans to compete in the 21st-century workforce. I hope the legislation will see swift approval in the House and Senate and the SKILLS Act will be on the President's desk in the coming weeks to see if he, indeed, will veto the bill that he asked for.

Mr. Speaker, the SKILLS Act will build a more dynamic and responsive workforce development system, give priority to well-paying, in-demand industries, expand opportunities at community colleges, and—most importantly—treat all job seekers as individuals. These changes are critical at a time when the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that more than 3.6 million open jobs are going unfilled because there aren't enough skilled candidates. Let's reform these programs to serve employers and individuals in an effective and efficient manner.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and the underlying bill. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the resolution, if ordered; and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 191, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—225

Aderholt	Gosar	Nugent
Alexander	Gowdy	Nunes
Amash	Granger	Nummelee
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Olson
Bachmann	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Bachus	Griffin (AR)	Paulsen
Barletta	Griffith (VA)	Pearce
Barr	Grimm	Perry
Barton	Guthrie	Petri
Benishek	Hall	Pittenger
Bentivolio	Harper	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Poe (TX)
Black	Hartzler	Pompeo
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Posey
Bonner	Heck (NV)	Price (GA)
Boustany	Hensarling	Radel
Brady (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Bridenstine	Holding	Reichert
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Renacci
Brooks (IN)	Huelskamp	Ribble
Buchanan	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)
Bucshon	Hultgren	Rigell
Burgess	Hunter	Roby
Calvert	Hurt	Roe (TN)
Camp	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Campbell	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)
Cantor	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (MI)
Capito	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Carter	Jones	Rokita
Cassidy	Jordan	Rooney
Chabot	Joyce	Ros-Lehtinen
Chaffetz	Kelly	Roskam
Coble	King (IA)	Ross
Coffman	King (NY)	Rothfus
Cole	Kingston	Royce
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Runyan
Collins (NY)	Kline	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	Labrador	Salmon
Cook	LaMalfa	Scalise
Cotton	Lamborn	Schock
Cramer	Lance	Schweikert
Crawford	Lankford	Scott, Austin
Crenshaw	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Daines	Latta	Sessions
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Denham	Long	Shuster
Dent	Lucas	Simpson
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
DesJarlais	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Duffy	Marino	Southerland
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Stewart
Duncan (TN)	Matheson	Stivers
Ellmers	McCarthy (CA)	Stockman
Farenthold	McCaul	Stutzman
Fincher	McClintock	Terry
Fitzpatrick	McKeon	Thompson (PA)
Fleischmann	McKinley	Thornberry
Fleming	McMorris	Tiberi
Flores	Rodgers	Tipton
Forbes	Meadows	Turner
Fortenberry	Meehan	Upton
Foxx	Messer	Valadao
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Wagner
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Garrett	Miller (MI)	Walden
Gerlach	Miller, Gary	Walorski
Gibbs	Mullin	Weber (TX)
Gibson	Mulvaney	Webster (FL)
Gingrey (GA)	Murphy (PA)	Wenstrup
Gohmert	Neugebauer	Whitfield
Goodlatte	Noem	Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack

Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

Young (FL)
Young (IN)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 191, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

AYES—226

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al

NAYS—191

Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens

NOT VOTING—15

Bilirakis
Broun (GA)
Castor (FL)
Conyers
Costa

Culberson
Gardner
Hanna
Himes
Lynch
Markey
McHenry
Napolitano
Smith (WA)
Westmoreland

□ 1712

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 14, 2013, I was absent during roll-call vote No. 70 due to being sick. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 113—“Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 803) to reform and strengthen the workforce investment system of the Nation to put Americans back to work and make the United States more competitive in the 21st century.”

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benish
Bentivoglio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger

Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene

NOES—191

Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markley
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens

NOT VOTING—14

Broun (GA)
Castor (FL)
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Culberson
Gardner
Hanna
Himes
Lynch
McHenry
Napolitano
Smith (WA)
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1719

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 14, 2013, I was absent during roll-call vote No. 71 due to being sick. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on H. Res. 113—“Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 803) to reform and strengthen the workforce investment system of the Nation to put

Americans back to work and make the United States more competitive in the 21st century.”

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 289, noes 125, answered “present” 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

AYES—289

Aderholt	DeGette	Jones
Alexander	Delaney	Jordan
Amodei	DeLauro	Joyce
Bachmann	DelBene	Kaptur
Bachus	DeSantis	Kelly
Barber	DesJarlais	Kennedy
Barletta	Deutch	Kildee
Barrow (GA)	Diaz-Balart	King (IA)
Barton	Doggett	King (NY)
Beatty	Doyle	Kingston
Becerra	Duckworth	Kline
Bentivolio	Duncan (SC)	Kuster
Bera (CA)	Duncan (TN)	Labrador
Bilirakis	Ellmers	LaMalfa
Bishop (GA)	Engel	Lamborn
Bishop (UT)	Enyart	Lankford
Black	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Blackburn	Farenthold	Larson (CT)
Blumenauer	Fattah	Latta
Bonamici	Fincher	Levin
Bonner	Fleischmann	Lipinski
Boustany	Fleming	Loebsack
Brady (TX)	Fortenberry	Lofgren
Braley (IA)	Foster	Long
Bridenstine	Frankel (FL)	Lowenthal
Brooks (AL)	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Brown (FL)	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Brownley (CA)	Gabbard	Lujan Grisham
Buchanan	Gallego	(NM)
Bucshon	Garamendi	Lujan, Ben Ray
Bustos	Garrett	(NM)
Calvert	Gibbs	Lummis
Camp	Gingrey (GA)	Maffei
Campbell	Goodlatte	Maloney, Sean
Cantor	Gosar	Marino
Capito	Gowdy	Markey
Capps	Granger	Massie
Cárdenas	Grayson	Matsui
Carney	Griffith (VA)	McCarthy (CA)
Carson (IN)	Grimm	McCarthy (NY)
Carter	Guthrie	McCaul
Cartwright	Hahn	McClintock
Cassidy	Hall	McCollum
Castro (TX)	Hanabusa	McIntyre
Chabot	Harper	McKeon
Cicilline	Harris	McMorris
Clay	Hartzler	Rodgers
Cleaver	Hastings (FL)	McNerney
Coble	Hastings (WA)	Meadows
Cole	Heck (WA)	Meeks
Collins (NY)	Hensarling	Messer
Conaway	Higgins	Mica
Connolly	Hinojosa	Michaud
Cook	Holt	Miller (FL)
Cooper	Horsford	Miller (MI)
Cramer	Huffman	Miller, Gary
Crawford	Huizenga (MI)	Moran
Crenshaw	Hultgren	Mullin
Cuellar	Hunter	Mulvaney
Cummings	Hurt	Murphy (FL)
Daines	Issa	Murphy (PA)
Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Nadler
Davis, Danny	Johnson, Sam	Neal

Neugebauer	Rothfus	Stutzman
Noem	Roybal-Allard	Swalwell (CA)
Nunes	Royce	Takano
Nunnelee	Ruiz	Thompson (PA)
O'Rourke	Runyan	Thornberry
Olson	Ruppersberger	Tierney
Palazzo	Ryan (WI)	Titus
Pascarell	Salmon	Tonko
Payne	Sanchez, Loretta	Tsongas
Pelosi	Scalise	Upton
Perlmutter	Schiff	Van Hollen
Perry	Schneider	Vargas
Petri	Schock	Wagner
Pingree (ME)	Schrader	Walden
Pitts	Schwartz	Walorski
Pocan	Schweikert	Walz
Polis	Scott (VA)	Wasserman
Pompeo	Scott, Austin	Schultz
Posey	Scott, David	Waters
Price (NC)	Sensenbrenner	Watt
Quigley	Serrano	Waxman
Reichert	Sessions	Weber (TX)
Rice (SC)	Shea-Porter	Webster (FL)
Richmond	Sherman	Welch
Roby	Shimkus	Whitfield
Roe (TN)	Shuster	Williams
Rogers (AL)	Simpson	Wilson (FL)
Rogers (KY)	Sinema	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NE)	Wolf
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Womack
Rokita	Smith (TX)	Yarmuth
Rooney	Southerland	Yoho
Ros-Lehtinen	Speier	Young (FL)
Roskam	Stewart	Young (IN)
Ross	Stockman	

NOES—125

Amash	Griffin (AR)	Pastor (AZ)
Andrews	Grijalva	Paulsen
Barr	Gutierrez	Pearce
Bass	Heck (NV)	Peters (CA)
Benishek	Herrera Beutler	Peters (MI)
Bishop (NY)	Holding	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Honda	Pittenger
Brooks (IN)	Hoyer	Poe (TX)
Burgess	Hudson	Price (GA)
Butterfield	Huelskamp	Radel
Capuano	Israel	Rahall
Chaffetz	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Chu	Jeffries	Reed
Clarke	Jenkins	Renacci
Clyburn	Johnson (OH)	Ribble
Coffman	Johnson, E. B.	Rigell
Cohen	Keating	Rush
Collins (GA)	Kilmer	Ryan (OH)
Conyers	Kind	Sánchez, Linda
Cotton	Kinzinger (IL)	T.
Courtney	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Crowley	Lance	Schakowsky
Davis, Rodney	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
DeFazio	Latham	Slaughter
Denham	Lee (CA)	Stivers
Dent	Lewis	Terry
Dingell	LoBiondo	Thompson (CA)
Duffy	Lowe	Thompson (MS)
Edwards	Maloney,	Tiberi
Ellison	Carolyn	Tipton
Esty	Marchant	Turner
Farr	Matheson	Valadao
Fitzpatrick	McDermott	Veasey
Flores	McGovern	Vela
Forbes	McKinley	Velázquez
Fox	Meehan	Visclosky
Fudge	Meng	Wenstrup
Garcia	Miller, George	Wittman
Gerlach	Moore	Woodall
Graves (GA)	Negrete McLeod	Yoder
Graves (MO)	Nolan	Young (AK)
Green, Al	Nugent	
Green, Gene	Pallone	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Owens
NOT VOTING—16

Broun (GA)	Gohmert	Sires
Castor (FL)	Hanna	Smith (WA)
Costa	Himes	Walberg
Culberson	Lynch	Westmoreland
Gardner	McHenry	
Gibson	Napolitano	

□ 1724

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote 70 on H.R. 803. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote 71 on H.R. 803. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote 72 on Approving the Journal. I would have voted “yea.”

BUDGET GAMES IN WASHINGTON

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of Georgians and folks all over our Nation who are sick and tired of the budget games in Washington.

Ask almost any American what happens if someone spends substantially more money than they take in, and they'll tell you that that individual will be plagued with debt and face limited economic opportunity.

But this commonsense reality seems to evade many of my friends in the other body. As evidenced by the recently proposed budget, this so-called plan increases taxes by \$1 trillion, proposes \$100 billion in new stimulus spending, and will never balance.

This mentality is exactly what got our Nation into this fiscal mess in the first place. However, I must commend my friends for at least finally putting down a budget on paper. It took them 4 years, and their plan certainly doesn't propose any new ideas, but at least they've articulated where they stand.

However, this administration remains delinquent in their duty to send a budget to Congress. The administration's budget is more than a month overdue, and news reports indicate it may come in April, if at all. They have complained that the delay is the result of Congressional debate surrounding the fiscal cliff and sequester.

Someone should tell this administration that using uncertainty created by their own policies to buck their responsibility to craft a budget is unconscionable. Attacking this body's balanced budget approach, when they haven't produced their own plan, unfortunately reveals their willingness to put partisan politics ahead of our Nation's fiscal future.

If this administration is truly concerned about the uncertainty, they should send to Congress a responsible balanced budget. This will put our Nation on the path to true fiscal responsibility.

MEDICARE AND THE RYAN BUDGET

(Mr. BERA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, the latest Ryan budget is déjà vu all

over again, only this time it's worse for our parents and grandparents. It will turn Medicare into a voucher system, and leave millions without the health care they need and deserve.

As a doctor, I've sat with these seniors when they're trying to choose between one medication or another, one treatment or another, and they can't afford it. This is just wrong. It's bad medicine.

Our parents and grandparents did not work their whole lives paying into a system only to be handed a voucher that doesn't even cover the cost of needed care.

If we work together, we can do better. We can lower the cost of health care. We must honor the promises that we've made to them, and make sure Medicare is secure and strengthened for the next generation.

Mr. RYAN, don't pull the plug on Medicare.

□ 1730

SKILLS ACT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will vote on the Supporting Knowledge and Investing in Lifelong Skills Act, or SKILLS Act. With 12 million Americans out of work and 3.6 million job openings unfilled, the SKILLS Act will modernize and reform our Federal workforce development programs and reauthorize the Workforce Investment Act.

As a former volunteer member of a Workforce Investment Board who had the responsibility for administering these training opportunities, I witnessed firsthand the difficulty and expense these duplicative and overlapping programs create. The SKILLS Act consolidates current programs efficiently so that individuals seeking training will be able to navigate the system with greater success and greater access. The SKILLS Act also refocuses the accountability and control at the local level rather than Washington.

Mr. Speaker, America's competitiveness depends on having a qualified and trained workforce. The SKILLS Act offers just that. President Obama called on Congress in 2012 to work with him to develop a skills training program that is more efficient and effective. The SKILLS Act does just that. Let's take action to put Americans back to work and make America more competitive.

INTRODUCTION OF THE WATER INFRASTRUCTURE NOW PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP ACT

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about a bill I introduced earlier today. It's called the Water Infrastructure Now Public-Private Partnership Act. Senator DURBIN and Senator KIRK from Illinois introduced the Senate version as well today.

My bill would improve the Nation's water infrastructure, including the aging locks and dams along the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers, through public-private partnerships that would expedite projects and save taxpayer money.

My bill would help clear a \$60 billion backlog of U.S. Army Corps projects that will take decades to complete without the help of private investment. It does this by creating a pilot program to explore agreements between the Army Corps of Engineers and private entities as alternatives to traditional financing, planning, design, and construction methods.

Mr. Speaker, the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers are absolutely critical to the economic well-being of not just my region, but also to the entire Midwest, the Nation, and even to the world. Many of these locks and dams were built during the administration of Franklin Roosevelt and are now more than 80 years old. That is why action must be taken to expand and modernize the locks and dams that help transport our goods and products worldwide.

HONORING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Every March we commemorate National Women's History Month, a time in which we highlight the many contributions of women who have shaped our great Nation. While we celebrate the tremendous achievements of pioneers who have paved the way, it is important to remember the young girls who need an encouraging environment so that they can grow up to become strong women of character. Education is key to make this happen.

Education is not simply a means to an end but, rather, a vital tool that can help overcome poverty, ignorance, and so much more. However, one in four girls in America does not finish high school, and the dropout rate is even higher for Hispanic teens. Nearly four in ten Hispanic girls will drop out of high school this year. This is alarming.

Mr. Speaker, let's stop this high school dropout rate for all teen girls, and I ask that we renew our commitment to put literacy on our national agenda. Literacy is paramount in the struggle for self-empowerment and education.

HONORING THE McDONNELL FAMILY

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the last memory that Lynn McDonnell has of her 7-year-old daughter, Grace, is of a beaming, beautiful girl blowing kisses to her from a bus as she went on her way to Sandy Hook Elementary School. Soon thereafter, tragedy struck. Grace and 19 of her classmates and six teachers were gunned down by a madman with a semiautomatic rifle.

Our country came together. We mourned together. And now, Mr. Speaker, I'm asking this Congress, come together and do something so no other family knows the sadness of the McDonnells.

Too many lives have been lost and too many communities have been torn apart by violence. Too many families have mourned the loss of their brothers and sisters. Too many people have endured unimaginable pain and grief caused by gun violence. When Lynn McDonnell and her husband, Chris, came to Washington for the State of the Union last month, she said Congress must choose "action over inaction." And I agree.

It's been exactly 3 months now since the Newtown massacre. For the McDonnells and the families in Newtown, Aurora, and my hometown of West Palm Beach, I say let's come together and pass responsible gun safety legislation.

THE HOMES OF CHRISTIANS ARE BURNED IN PAKISTAN

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Christians are under attack in the Muslim nation of Pakistan. Christians live in fear of being persecuted because of their faith. They also can face life in prison or even death if convicted of insulting Islam.

Some say that the religious laws are used as a tool to deal with personal vendettas. A Christian man living in Pakistan last week was accused of committing blasphemy. Suddenly, a large group of men—a mob from a nearby mosque—stormed his home Friday night. The man was arrested. Fearing for their safety, hundreds of other Christian families fled in the dark of the night. On Saturday morning, the mob, as shown in this photograph, returned and began ransacking more Christian homes and setting them ablaze. According to Human Rights activists, more than 100 Christian homes were burned.

Mr. Speaker, Pakistan takes our money but they do not respect the human rights of religious minorities. Some radical Muslims believe that

other religions should be tolerant of their faith, but they are not tolerant of Christians and other Muslim sects. This ought not to be.

But that's just the way it is.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF JEAN T. MARTIN

(Ms. SEWELL of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to the life and legacy of Mrs. Jean T. Martin, a beloved Alabamian who passed away March 11 in Selma, Alabama, at the age of 89. As a dedicated public servant, Jean Martin was known in our local community as a long-serving Selma city councilwoman, an avid local historian, and a gifted journalist.

Personally, Jean was a close friend and trusted mentor. I am deeply saddened by her passing, but I am comforted in knowing that her legacy will live on through the countless life lessons she taught to so many of us.

Jean Martin worked tirelessly as a community editor for the Selma Times Journal. For more than 30 years, she served in various capacities at the newspaper.

She was also an exemplary public servant. She served on the Selma City Council from 1996 to 2008, representing Ward 3, and eventually became the council's president pro tem. During her tenure, she was an exceptional public servant who passionately represented Selma.

On a personal note, Jean Martin served with my mother, Nancy Gardner Sewell, on the Selma City Council and was a beloved colleague and close family friend. My brothers and I affectionately called her "T Jean." She was an amazing mentor and role model to me, and I credit my love of community to her extraordinary example. I am now in Congress and I stand on her shoulders because of the many glass ceilings of this strong woman who died at 89. She was a wonderful public servant.

I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in paying tribute to the life and legacy of Jean Martin.

□ 1740

CONGRATULATING HAYWARD HIGH SCHOOL'S LADY 'CANES

(Mr. DUFFY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Hayward High School's Lady 'Canes for winning the WIAA State Hockey Championship. In only their sixth year of playing varsity-level hockey, the Lady 'Canes defeated the Onalaska Hilltoppers in a thrilling 5-2 match. The Lady 'Canes out-skated their top-ranked opponent for three periods and took home Hayward High School's first hockey cham-

pionship. Let me tell you what, as a Hurricane, it has been way too long.

With great leadership from their coaches, combined with the perseverance of the players, they showed the true spirit Wisconsinites have for sports and competition. These ladies would get up at 6:45 in the morning before school, training 5 to 6 days a week, participating in community service, and never losing sight of the importance of education.

So, today, I stand before you with a pink tie saying congratulations to Hayward High School's Lady 'Canes for a job well done. Congratulations.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Members are reminded not to traffic the well while other Members are under recognition.

REPUBLICAN HOUSE BUDGET

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. The House Republican budget resolution is a blueprint for stalled growth, joblessness, and abandonment of American families.

Since 2010, Congress has cut services and investments critical to American families by \$1.5 trillion. Sequestration slashed an additional \$68 billion, which will cost 750,000 jobs this year alone.

This budget resolution will exacerbate this damage by cutting an additional \$1 trillion over 10 years from funding levels agreed to in the Budget Control Act. It would have a severe impact on critical services and investments like veterans' benefits, homeland security, schools, medical research, law enforcement, and Pell Grants.

It is time to stop the mindless cuts to critical services and investments and support job growth and middle class families.

OPEN THE PEOPLE'S HOUSE

(Mr. STEWART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in defense of the common people of America—people who don't have annual vacations to Hawaii, people who don't fly to their vacations on private jets. Many of these families save for months or even years in order to visit Washington, D.C., and one of the things they expect to do when they come here is to be able to visit the White House, which is the people's House. And now this President has closed it in order to make a political point. Now that that decision has proven unpopular, he has done something that he has frequently done before and that is to blame someone else. He says it wasn't my decision; it was the Secret Service who made the decision to close the White House.

It only costs the White House \$3.7 million to keep it open to tourists for an entire year. That's much less than this President will spend on any single vacation that he takes, which is why I introduced a resolution in the House yesterday asking the President to forego any more taxpayer-funded vacations until he opens the people's House once again.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the President to consider this request. Open the people's House, Mr. President. Open it up for the people of America.

IMPACTS OF SEQUESTRATION

(Mr. BARBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, sequestration has been in effect for just 2 weeks, and the impacts of these mandatory, across-the-board cuts already are deeply affecting the lives of my constituents in southern Arizona.

Cuts to the Border Patrol are not only among the most devastating cuts caused by sequestration; they will seriously erode the progress we've made toward securing our border. Border Patrol agents have been told that they will be furloughed without pay for 1 day per pay period, and much of their overtime will be eliminated.

Taken together, these actions will greatly reduce the pay of these Border Patrol agents by between 20 and 40 percent. We must work together to immediately come to grips with this problem to restore these cuts so the border can once again be safe and secure.

SECOND TIME IS A CHARM FOR TRAVIS TIGERS

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, my own district, Texas 22, is where Texas high school basketball champions reside.

B.F. Terry High School in Rosenberg won the 4A State Championship last Saturday. Right after that game, the Travis Tigers took the court to chase after the Texas 5A title. Travis had lost in the State championship game last year. They were determined to bring the trophy home this year, and they did just that by defeating South Grand Prairie 46-38. Led by the Harrison twins, Aaron and Andrew, the Travis defense smothered Grand Prairie from the start by allowing two baskets in 20 attempts.

Congratulations to Coach Brownson and the whole team. Find a spot in the school's trophy case because the Travis Tigers are the champs.

SETTING PRIORITIES AND BALANCING THE BUDGET

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, this week, I had the opportunity to hold a Congress on Your Corner event with my constituents in Bloomington, Minnesota. During one-on-one conversations, I was able to discuss the issues that my neighbors feel are important in Congress.

The number one issue that did come up, Mr. Speaker, was the awareness that for far too long Americans have been tightening their belts only to watch as Washington's addiction to spending continues to grow along with our Nation's debt.

This week, the House Budget Committee passed a budget that the House will vote on next week. This is important, Mr. Speaker, because it is a budget that addresses the serious fiscal challenges that are facing our Nation.

First, it outlines tax reform so that it is simpler, fair, and more competitive to grow our economy. Secondly, it actually produces a balanced budget. Why is this important? A balanced budget will give young people more opportunity; a balanced budget will protect programs and preserve programs that are essential for seniors; and most importantly, Mr. Speaker, a balanced budget will encourage and promote a healthier economy.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for Washington to take a lesson from Minnesota families and deliver on a balanced budget.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS UNVEILS THE BACK TO WORK BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus to repeat and enhance our calls made by our colleagues today to talk about the budget introduced by the House Republicans.

We have a number of members of the Progressive Caucus who will be addressing various components of the budget. I will start out with one of the freshman Members from the great State of California (Mr. TAKANO).

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TAKANO. I'd like to thank my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, for yielding the time this evening.

Earlier today, I was joined by 22 of my fellow freshman Democrats in sending a letter to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) requesting specifics for his 2014 budget.

□ 1750

As freshman Members, we had hoped Mr. RYAN's budget provided areas where both parties, Democrats and Republicans, could find common ground.

Instead, what was presented was a document that was vague. How can we begin to negotiate when we don't even know what we're negotiating? And where Mr. RYAN is specific, it's in areas that he knows that Democrats won't agree.

Ezra Klein of The Washington Post described Mr. RYAN's so-called "Path to Prosperity" in the following ways:

He cuts deep into spending on health care for the poor and some combination of education, infrastructure, research, public safety and low-income families. The Affordable Care Act's Medicare cuts remain, but the military is spared, as is Social Security. There's a vague individual tax reform plan that leaves only two brackets—10 percent and 25 percent—and will require either huge, deficit busting tax cuts or increasing taxes on poor and middle class households, as well as a vague corporate tax reform plan that lowers the rate from 35 to 25 percent.

After reading Mr. RYAN's budget, I find this document bears a striking resemblance to the tactics used by the Romney campaign: Promise massive tax cuts but don't provide any specifics on how to pay for them. This is surprising since Mr. RYAN is considered a "serious" policy maker.

My colleagues who joined me today don't expect to agree with everything in Mr. RYAN's budget. But as we detailed in our letter today, we hope to find areas of common ground so that our country can move forward. Only then can we begin to tackle the fiscal challenges facing our Nation.

Mr. POCAN. I would like to thank the gentleman from California. As a member of the Budget Committee that marked up the bill yesterday, we had spent the entire day considering the budget proposal that was introduced by our Republican colleagues. From the beginning, it was clear that the budget represented little more than recycled policies that have already been rejected by the American people and unrealistic proposals that will never occur.

We had an opportunity in committee to focus on areas where Democrats and Republicans could come together to grow our economy and responsibly reduce our deficit. Instead, we were given a budget that is based on math gimmicks and absurd assumptions, assumptions like trying to keep the savings from the Affordable Care Act while repealing its benefits. Well, that has about as much credibility as if we had said in the budget we should hire leprechauns to grab pots of gold at the end of rainbows and count that as revenue. It is simply not realistic.

As a small business owner and as a former cochair of the Wisconsin joint committee on finance, I've worked on budgets for years and years. We used to spend 8 hours a day, 3 days a week for 4 months making sure that each and every detail meant something in a budget because a budget is a statement of our values, where do we stand as a country, or, in that case, as the State of Wisconsin.

Unfortunately, we didn't take the time to make those tough choices with

the budget that was presented to us. Instead, we were given a budget that balances the budget on the backs of seniors and working class families. It's not a tough choice. It's a reckless and irresponsible choice.

Our budget should reflect our values, and the GOP budget does not reflect Wisconsin's values. And I don't believe it reflects the values of middle class families across the country.

Mr. Speaker, the type of choices that we were given from the Republicans in presenting their budget included things from keeping the sequester in place that you heard earlier have had terrible effects across the country and will continue to in the coming months of this current budget, like turning Medicare into a voucher system, a system that breaks the promise to the American people that we've had about Medicare for so long.

It includes trillions in undisclosed spending cuts with absolutely no information on where they'll come from other than eventually they're going to come from the middle class through losing some of the current proposals that we have in place in the law. Ultimately, all these will harm our economic growth and stunt the positive gains we've made in the economy just as recently as last month.

In fact, the Economic Policy Institute has found that the GOP Ryan budget released yesterday would result in 2 million fewer jobs next year alone. It would decrease our gross domestic product by 1.7 percent and stall our Nation's economic recovery.

What the budget does, and we can tell this in my State of Wisconsin and across the country, is, one, it keeps the sequester in place. And we've already been told that could cost 750,000 jobs nationwide, including 36,000 in my State of Wisconsin. The budget would turn the Medicare program into a voucher program, forcing 873,753 Wisconsin seniors out of the traditional Medicare plan when the conversion happens and breaking the promise that kept the link to increasing costs and having increasing funds that go with it. Finally, it would increase tax breaks for the very wealthy and big businesses but cost middle class families \$2,000 annually in new taxes.

We must remember the biggest threat to our long-term economic security at this time is not the deficit; it's our economy. It's about jobs. It's the 12 million people that are unemployed in this country. We need to be making investments in American workers, in American ingenuity, in education, research and development, and infrastructure, and that's what will get the people of America back to work.

We have a budget that does just that, and I'm proud to support the Congressional Progressive Caucus' Back to Work Budget. The Back to Work Budget invests in America's future because the best way to reduce our long-term deficit is to put America back to work, get people back working and get people into jobs.

Just last week, the Congressional Budget Office released a report finding that half of the deficit in 2013 and three-quarters of the deficit in 2014 will be due to economic weakness. That means people being unemployed or underemployed and paying less in revenue rather than structural budget policies like defense spending, entitlement spending, or overall tax policy.

So the very problem we're facing is that people aren't working and aren't able to pay taxes and guide the economy like we need to. If they're doing that, we would make up three-quarters of the deficit in the next budget year alone.

Plain and simple, we need to get the American people back to work, and the Back to Work Budget does that by targeting a goal of 5 percent unemployment through investments in infrastructure, education, hiring back laid-off teachers, aid to States, rehiring police, firefighters, and other public employees, investing in a public works jobs program, and giving tax credits to companies that create jobs in America instead of the tax breaks that are still under the Republican budget that help companies that send jobs overseas.

So I'm hopeful that as this budget process moves forward, we can turn our attention back to job growth as our budget does and not backwards to the rejected policies of the past.

I would like to share a few stories that I've collected from my district from constituents who have written us about the budget, about the sequester that continues in the Republican budget, as well as the budget proposals in front of us. Let me read one from a reverend in Beloit, Wisconsin. Beloit, Wisconsin, is in Rock County, and the chairman of the Budget Committee, Representative RYAN, and I split Rock County right down the middle. So these are people that we both talk to on a regular basis.

This is a reverend in Beloit who had been diagnosed with lung cancer. This is what he writes:

This morning, I was reading more about the cuts coming on March 1. One of the areas that could be cut is cancer research, to the tune of \$250 million. This is frightening to me. I'm married with two girls, ages 8 and 4. Three years ago, I was diagnosed with a rare form of nonsmoker's lung cancer. I went through chemo and radiation, and we thought we got it all. Last year, we discovered the cancer was back and in my bones. So I started a new pill. Within 2 months, all of the spots are gone, and I'm in remission. It is because of the funding for cancer research that I am alive today and my girls have their father. I have been told that the cancer will eventually build an immunity to my pill, so there are a number of other medications in trial now. If the funding is cut, my next miracle pill may not be there. I heard that these cuts could set back cancer research 5 years. Please, do what you can to make sure these cuts don't happen and people like me can beat back this nasty disease.

That's just from one constituent in my district from a county that just happens to be shared by the person who authored the budget that keeps these

sequester cuts and these cuts to research in place.

□ 1800

Let me read one more, and then I'm going to introduce one of my colleagues, the cochair of the Progressive Caucus.

This is from a mother in Evansville, Wisconsin, also in Rock County, the county that I share with the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN. This was received back at the end of February:

My son-in-law will be laid off next week due to the sequester. This is extremely difficult for his family.

My daughter works for the State and has not had a raise in years, and pays more for her health insurance and retirement since all the State's woes are blamed on State employees and teachers. Her cut in pay is deep.

Our family will not be buying a house or a car, going out to dinner or purchasing anything from any local entrepreneur due to these issues. Does this help the economy? Nope. It's time to fix this so that the little people are not being harmed the most.

Now I'd like to yield some time to my colleague from Minneapolis, the co-chair of the Progressive Caucus and one of the authors of our budget plan for the Progressive Caucus, Representative KEITH ELLISON.

Mr. ELLISON. Let me thank you, Congressman POCAN.

One of the great things about this 113th Congress is that you and a number of other awesome new Members have joined us to really lend your creativity or expertise to advocating for the American people, the American working man and woman. You hail from the great State of Wisconsin, which is where I think collective bargaining began.

Am I right about that?

Mr. POCAN. Absolutely, Representative ELLISON. We are very proud to be not only the creator of collective bargaining, but I believe also unemployment compensation and other great provisions for workers across America.

Mr. ELLISON. Congressman, you come from a State, "Fighting Bob" La Follette. We all know about his wonderful legacy.

And we all love TAMMY BALDWIN. When she told us she was running for the Senate, we didn't know how anybody could fulfill her tremendous legacy, but you've walked into this building, and you have stepped up right away. So I just want to say thank you for the work that you're doing.

Just if I may take a few moments to talk about the Back to Work Budget.

There will be all kinds of budgets being discussed. The Republican budget authored by Congressman RYAN has already been the subject of a lot of conversation.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the real criteria that we should use to evaluate a budget is how well it puts people back to work, and that's why we have the Back to Work Budget. The Back to Work Budget is about—guess what—putting people back to work.

Our budget is not an austerity budget. In our budget, we don't try to compete with how many people we can lay off and how many programs we can shut down. We say to the American people, We don't have a debt crisis. We have a debt problem in the out-years, but we don't have a debt crisis. Do you know what kind of crisis we've got? A job crisis. You know what? We've got to fix it.

In 1976 when we passed the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment Act, Americans regarded it as a national outrage that we had 6.3 percent unemployment. We have 7.7 percent now. That's way better than at the height of the recession. I remember in January of 2009, we were losing 700,000 jobs a month, and we're now adding them. But we are not adding them nearly fast enough.

I think that a lot of credit goes around due to the fact that we've had 36 months of positive job growth, but we don't have enough yet. So I think we need a budget that reflects the national priority of putting people back to work.

Mr. Speaker, as the people will stand back and say, well, is this budget good or is this budget bad? I'm hearing so much from the talking heads on television. I think, Mr. Speaker, the people need to ask themselves a very simple question: Does this budget put people back to work or not?

Congressman RYAN's budget, the Republican budget, according to the Congressional Budget Office, is going to lay off a lot of people. According to the Economic Policy Institute, it would be 2 million people in 2014. That's a lot of people. We don't need to be laying people off. We need to be hiring them.

So I want to turn back to you, Mr. POCAN, because I don't want to just talk the whole time. But I do want to say, the Back to Work Budget is a budget that puts Americans back to work, and I think that's a good thing.

In a moment, we can talk about one of my constituents.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative ELLISON.

When you talked about the 2 million jobs that we'll lose in 2014 alone and the loss of the gross domestic product, there is no question that these are the challenges we're facing with the budget before us.

What we didn't mention is that the only folks who are really going to benefit are the most wealthy. Under the plan that's been released by the Republicans, they're changing the tax rates and lowering it for those who make the most money; and the trillions that it's going to cost to make up for that is going to have to come from somewhere, but it's not outlined in the budget.

What does that mean they're going to have to go after? They're going to have to go after the very tax breaks that the middle class rely on. That means your mortgage interest tax deduction could be on the chopping line under the Republican version of the

budget. The largest investment that the middle class ever make in their lifetime is their home, and the fact that we help incentivize that investment so that people live in strong neighborhoods and safe communities could be on the chopping line. The very fact that you could take away the employer's ability to deduct some of their health care costs could be on the chopping line. The child tax credit, for people who have children who have an opportunity to get back to work but need to have their children cared for, helps 25 million people across the country, including military families, that could be on the chopping line.

What they're silent about in the Republican budget is that they keep the deduction for corporate jets and they keep the subsidy to oil companies and they keep a number of deductions that do not benefit the middle class.

It's not just the jobs, Mr. Speaker, that are costs in the version of the budget, the 2 million jobs next year alone on top of the jobs we are losing through the sequester that we are facing right now, but it's this inequity in the tax system that is once again going to benefit the most wealthy at the expense of the many.

Another thing that I think is worthwhile mentioning as we are talking about middle class families is what is going to happen to Medicare.

My mother is 84 years old. In fact, she lives in the district in Wisconsin of the chairman of the committee. She is one of those countless seniors that cut pills in half because they couldn't afford to be able to afford medication at the time when she was trying to get by at 84 with a limited income.

It's those sorts of things, if we change that into a voucher program and we don't keep up that Medicare promise that people will have money to keep up with health care costs, that go away. Seniors will pay thousands more in the future because of the change by breaking that Medicare promise. That's not even talking about the Medicaid changes, Mr. Speaker.

There are so many changes that will cost middle class families that we need to make sure we have a more sound version, and that more sound version that the Progressive Caucus puts forward is the Back to Work Budget.

The Back to Work Budget will invest right now on getting people back into the marketplace and able to have a living and able to work and be able to pay taxes. When you have more people paying taxes, as we have already shown, three-quarters of the deficit in the next year will be due to unemployment and underemployment. By getting people back to work, that is the single best way to address the deficit.

With that, I'd like to yield a little time back to my colleague from Minneapolis, Mr. ELLISON.

Mr. ELLISON. Again, Congressman POCAN, thank you for your truly spoken words.

I just want to tell a few folks a couple of things. One is there is an alter-

native to Congressman RYAN's budget and that of the Republicans, and it's called the Back to Work Budget. There's going to be a Democratic Caucus budget, which I'm sure will put Americans back to work, too. But so far, in terms of the ones that have been released, the Back to Work Budget is the right budget. Ezra Klein says so. If folks want to look at Ezra Klein's recent column today, he says this is the right budget. Look at Jared Bernstein. He's thumbs-up on the Back to Work Budget. If you want to see economists and noted journalists who really scrutinize this stuff, evaluate the budgets, they'll tell you about the Back to Work Budget.

What I'd like to do for a moment, though, is to tell you about a constituent, Mr. Mark Krey. Mark Krey asked me to share his story. It goes like this:

I'm a special education paraprofessional at Heritage Middle School. I live in St. Paul, Minnesota.

That's Mark right there.

Last year, we had an average of 28 kids per class in middle school. This year, it's up to 35 kids.

□ 1810

That is like a big jump.

If a class has special education students, the teacher gets a special education paraprofessional like me to help, so then you have 35 students with two adults in the classroom. That's just not the way to educate our future Americans. Our class sizes keep going up, and the services are going down. More budget cuts would be devastating to my school district and to schools across the country. My coworkers and I would face furloughs and layoffs, and the kids we serve would lose out on the quality education they need to be future leaders.

I want to thank Mark Craig for caring about kids with special education needs and also for caring, not just about the individual kid, but about the system in which the kid's going to school. We can't just keep on disinvesting in kids like this, Mr. Speaker. We've got to throw the shoulder behind these kids, not abandon them.

One of the fundamental differences between Republicans and Democrats and the Back to Work Budget versus the Ryan budget is that, look, the Republicans, I don't doubt their compassion. They care about people, and they donate to charities; but it seems like they don't believe that government can help anyone. They think, oh, government can't do any good. Just cut it and cut it because it can't do any good.

That's absolutely wrong. All you've got to do is ask a teacher like Mark Craig, who every day teaches kids who have learning disabilities and who could be awesome, but if their budgets are cut and if there are tons of kids in the classroom, they really can't.

The Back to Work Budget recognizes a central truth, which is that, yes, it's the private sector that is a very important part of our American culture and part of our American way of life, but it's also the public sector and the

mixed economy working together that helps Americans succeed.

The Back to Work Budget says we're going to rebuild infrastructure, get rid of those crumbling bridges and roads, put in some energy grids, fix our wastewater treatment, put in some transit, put in some high-speed rail. We're going to do that. Then we're also going to engage the private sector with the Make Work Pay credit. Then we're going to do things like help support local heroes like Mark Craig, who is a paraprofessional in the education sector, but also cops. In my home State of Minnesota, we're going to have a cut, because of the sequester, of \$200,000. This is money that we use to train police officers to be better and more effective and to serve the public better, and we're not going to have that.

I'm not here to put my friends on the other side of the aisle down. I'm here to say they've got another vision of America, and that vision of America is that government can't help people and that government can't do anything right. They're wrong. The interstate highway system, hey, that's government. The interstate highway is government. There are police who walk the beat and make sure that the shopkeeper's stuff is not ripped off. That's government. So this whole thing about, oh, government is always wrong is wrong, and it's time for the American people to say responsive government does great things for the American people, along with the private sector, and we need to stop this free market extremism.

With that, I'm going to yield back to the gentleman from Wisconsin. I'm going to be around a little more. I know we've been joined by the gentleman from Florida. I am very happy to have him back in Congress after a 2-year hiatus. He was awesome then and he is awesome now, so I'll be listening carefully.

Mr. POCAN. I would like to thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

As you said, we've heard from Representative TAKANO from California, from yourself and myself from the heartland, and now we have one of the most solid Progressives in the U.S. House, a Representative from the Orlando, Florida, area, Representative ALAN GRAYSON, to whom I yield my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you very much. I appreciate that. I want to share something with the Representative from Wisconsin and with the Chair.

We labor here under an awful barrier, and that barrier is this: we are required to actually be original. I sometimes am unable to carry that burden, and I found something this Saturday that I think was so important, so well written, so profound that I am going to yield to an article that I read on Saturday in the Huffington Post, written by Jason Linkins and Zach Carter, called 'Dow Jones Hits 'Record High' Thanks to Strong Performances from Smoke,

Mirrors Sectors.” I’d like to share that with the gentleman from Wisconsin, the Chair, and with anyone else who just might happen to be listening right now.

The article reads as follows:

This week, amid the hullabaloo over President Barack Obama’s Deficit Dinner Diplomacy and Senator Rand Paul’s 13-hour filibuster-cum-dissertation on drone strikes and civil liberties, financial news-watchers touted a milestone in their lives of Market Worship. We speak, of course, of the Dow Jones Industrial Average, which on Tuesday hit an “all-time high” of 14,253. The good times rolled steadily on through the week, and the Dow closed Friday at 14,397.

Of course, the notion that these were “record” highs was not, strictly speaking, true. As Jeff Cox at CNBC pointed out, “In inflation-adjusted dollars, the Dow would need to hit 15,731 to break the record.” Nevertheless, the exciting new ordinal number sitting on the stock market index set off a chorus of hallelujahs. After all, this was the highest mark it had hit since October 2007. (Of course, if we recall correctly, that was right around the time that all of our more recent tragic economic events began to occur.)

The fluctuations of the Dow are typically pored over by the media in the same way that ancient oracles pierced through the entrails of birds, seeking for whatever path might lead to the most prosperity. And in the world of politics, partisans on both sides are quick to point to the Dow as generic confirmation that their policies are working as long as the story suits their narrative anyway.

And these narratives can get wild and weird and woolly quickly. Seemingly within moments of the Dow’s peak, “Dow 36,000” author James Glassman was on the pages of Bloomberg View, taking credit for this and crowing about how his old, failed predictions were well on the way to coming true.

Of course, as Jonathan Chait points out, Glassman has to toss out the entire underlying thesis of “Dow 36,000.” (He and co-author Kevin Hassett “theorized that the stock market, circa 1999, was being so undervalued that it would have been at 36,000 in the days ahead of the massive tech-bubble burst as opposed to theorizing that “some-day, maybe the Dow would hit 36,000. Probably. You know, just watch”) in order to claim vindication now.

Former Reagan domestic policy adviser Bruce Bartlett just called Glassman a “nitwit” and left it at that.

All of which leads to an obvious point: although we recognize that the long-term trend of the stock market is that it has an overall upward trajectory—punctuated in snapshots by the susurrations of the greed/fear cycle—it is nevertheless catnip for a lot of wild-eyed prognosticators, and the overreliance of using the stock market as evidence of economic recovery, or the proof of economic fundamentals, is acute.

So what does it say about the Dow that it could hit this dizzying new height—impressive by any measure in any era, post-crash or otherwise—at a time when the overall global economic outlook is so dismal and the domestic recovery is barely felt by the citizens who sacrificed their capital to save the world from calamity?

It says that we should be gravely concerned. It says that we have a two-tiered economy, one where profits flow and another where risks lurk. It says that a lot of people are being left behind, and if October 2007 is any guide, it says that this display of prosperity may simply be an illusion.

The distribution of the stock market’s largesse has been the most un-egalitarian as-

pect of American economics for years. A full 50 percent of all capital gains go not to the richest 1 percent of Americans, but to the richest 0.1 percent, according to The Washington Post.

But the stock market’s persistent upward climb since the spring of 2009 has revealed another massive disparity: the multinational corporate machinery that generates stock gains has become unmoored from the economic reality in which the majority of Americans live and die.

The Dow hit its peak this week amid a host of gloomy global economic forecasts. Back in January, the World Bank “sharply reduced its estimate of global economic growth in 2013, projecting that the downturn in Europe and the United States’ fiscal problems will continue to weigh on investment and spending.” The World Bank’s take on U.S. growth was similarly dismal—its 1.9 percent forecast for the coming year was less than the most pessimistic estimates of our own Federal Reserve.

□ 1820

There’s no end in sight for the austerity orgy that’s exacerbating Eurozone pain, despite the fact that the EU projects that their economy, “which generates nearly a fifth of global output, will shrink 0.3 percent in 2013.” (Analysts are currently divided on whether or not China is also experiencing a slowdown at the moment as well.)

Closer to home, we received a gentle boost from this month’s employment numbers: 236,000 jobs were created this past month, pending after-the-fact revisions in the months to come, which is closer to the ideal in terms of keeping ahead of labor market growth and finally digging out of the post-crash hole. The overall unemployment rate has subsequently dropped to 7.7 percent. But these numbers can mask a bevy of problems. As Matt Yglesias points out, the situation for the long-term unemployed is becoming a bona fide crisis that calls for “targeted interventions.”

And even if the unemployment number continues to drop, there’s a real concern over what sort of jobs are being added back to the economy. Will they be the quality jobs that put those entering those jobs and reentering those jobs into the labor force on a sustainable path to household prosperity? Or is everyone heading to a future of toil in Amazon shipping warehouses? It’s worth being fretful, because many of those who will be entering the job market for the first time will be carrying student loans out of a period of sky-high college tuition, which taken as a whole may form the backbone of the next great financial crisis.

Even as the economy has tipped and trended in the direction of what we might normally call—nominally call—“recovery,” the answer to the question “Who has recovered?” reveals some stark contrast.

As the University of California, Berkeley economics professor Emmanuel Saez calculated, losses in average family income during the Great Recession were felt across the board. Average real income per family declined by 17 percent. And the top income earners took it on the chin a little harder. As the bottom 99 percent experienced a 12 percent drop in average income, the uppermost percentile’s income fell by 36 percent. As Saez reports, “The sharp fall in top incomes is explained primarily by the collapse of realized capital gains due to the stock market crash.”

Of course, the top 1 percent, nevertheless, were largely sheltered from the stresses that afflicted the most vulnerable, as you would expect. What you, perhaps, didn’t expect was how the recovery distributed itself across the same groups.

From 2009 to 2011, average real income per family grew modestly by 1.7 percent, but the gains were very uneven. Top 1 percent incomes grew by 11.2 percent while bottom 99 percent incomes shrunk by 0.4 percent. Hence, the top 1 percent captured net 100 percent, but 121 percent of the income gains in the first 2 years of the recovery. From 2009 to 2010, the top 1 percent grew fast and then stagnated from 2010 to 2011. The bottom 99 percent stagnated both from 2009 to 2010 and from 2010 to 2011. In 2012, the top 1 percent income will likely surge due to booming stock prices, as well as the re-timing of income to avoid the higher 2013 top tax rates. The bottom 99 percent will likely grow much more modestly than top incomes from 2011 to 2012.

This suggests that the Great Recession has only depressed top income shares temporarily and will not undo any of the dramatic increase in top income shares that has taken place since the 1970s.

Much of the economic recovery is simply an increase in the value of financial assets—stocks and bonds. And most people just don’t own stocks. In 2011, only 21 percent of American adults even had a 401(k) retirement account, according to a HuffPost analysis of data from the Investment Company Institute. Only 52 percent of all adults older than 65 receive money from financial assets at all, with half of that set receiving less than \$1,260 a year, according to the Pension Rights Center.

Growth that everyone relies on, like that of home values and wages, has been sluggish. At the end of 2012, the S&P/Case-Shiller Home Price Indices were roughly where they were at the beginning of 2009 (which was roughly where they were in the fall of 2003).

And even as the stock market hits this celebrated peak, the wages that average Americans are bringing home to, you know, “put food on their family,” as George W. Bush famously said, those are plunging into a trough, despite measurable gains in overall productivity.

In fact, as Robert Reich points out, the way those productivity gains are being achieved leaves out workers altogether, and they are coming about as a result of actions taken by policymakers:

“Corporations have been investing in technology rather than their workers. They get tax credits and deductions for such investments. They get no such tax benefits for improving the skills of their employees. As a result, corporations can now do more with fewer people on their payrolls. That means higher profits.”

Reich adds:

“Joblessness all but eliminates the bargaining power of most workers, allowing corporations to keep wages low. Public policies that might otherwise reduce unemployment, a new WPA or CCC to hire the long-term unemployed, major investments in the Nation’s crumbling infrastructure, have been rejected in favor of austerity economics. This also means higher profits, at least in the short run.”

In other words, the labor force is being squeezed for the very last drop of productivity, because employers know that they’re holding all the cards. If the economy were approaching full employment, discontented or overworked employees would have options and leverage. Right now, they don’t. If you’ve got a job, you need to hang on to it for dear life. That’s an environment for scraping out survival, not the economic mobility we rightly celebrate during boom years.

Another thing to keep in mind is that the Dow is hitting this peak at a time when everyone in the world knows that the debate over sequestration—whose cuts have awesome recession-generating powers—has gone

into vapor-lock, with the GOP refusing to compromise on raising revenues, through the very tax reform proposals that formed the basis of the party's recent Presidential campaign.

Everyone has been warned about the consequences of sequestration. It's just that corporate America currently has the fortunate position of being able to greet the news with a shrug, as *The New York Times* reported this week:

"With \$85 billion in automatic cuts taking effect between now and September 30 as part of the so-called Federal budget sequestration, some experts warn that economic growth will be reduced by at least half a percentage point. But although experts estimate that sequestration could cost the country about 700,000 jobs, Wall Street does not expect the cuts to substantially reduce corporate profits, or seriously threaten the recent rally in the stock markets."

"It's minimal," said Savita Subramanian, head of United States equity and quantitative strategy at Bank of America Merrill Lynch. Overall, the sequester could reduce earnings at the biggest companies by just over 1 percent, she said, adding, "the market wants more austerity."

Well, if that's true, the market is going to love the dire, short-term consequences that the sequestration is going to bring to many Americans closer to the ground level of the economy. Reich rounds up those who will be hit hardest and most immediately. One hundred and twenty-five thousand people are going to lose their rental subsidies. Ten thousand more will be cut off from similar subsidies intended to assist Americans living in rural areas. One hundred thousand people face getting kicked out of emergency homeless shelters, and cuts are coming to unemployment insurance, title I education programs, Head Start, and antihunger subsidies.

It's not like those who bid on the stock market can't grasp the looming disaster. They're just completely unconcerned. As you may recall, the market didn't exactly take to its fainting couch as the so-called "fiscal cliff" loomed, either, despite dire warnings of a market spasm.

□ 1830

That's what carting off 121 percent of an economic recovery will do for a person safely ensconced atop the income ladder.

Fittingly, even as the sequestration's hammer is poised to come down, *The Wall Street Journal* reports that the market for luxury goods is booming. The newspaper characterizes this as evidence of economic robustness, connecting "the economy has bounced back from recession" to "as a result, wealthy Americans are spending freely on expensive clothing, accessories, jewelry and beauty products."

The Wall Street Journal quotes HSBC luxury-goods analyst Antoine Belge thusly: "Trends in luxury consumption in the United States have continued to outperform overall consumer trends." This is actually evidence that you and most people you know are getting left far behind in the post-crash economy.

The average participant in the overall American economy isn't fooled by any of this. They well know what Matt Phillips pointed out at Quartz, that household incomes "haven't gone anywhere but down." As Phillips relates, "Real median U.S. household income—that's 'real' as in 'adjusted for inflation'—was \$50,054 in 2011, the most recent data available from the U.S. Census Bureau. That's 8 percent lower than the 2007 peak of \$54,489."

He goes on to show that consumer expectations strike a serious contrast from the mood within the Dow Jones revival tent.

We are led then, inevitably, to a conclusion that we all feel but no one says aloud.

And, by the way, that's my job, to say all the things that we all feel but no one says aloud.

The American middle class, in other words, no longer lives in a financial economy. But the gold-standard economic metrics that we hold out as the key measurements of prosperity, the economy of Wall Street, of gross domestic product figures, of the Dow Jones Industrial Average, is purely, purely financial.

For the time being, you can assume that you and everyone you care about is screwed. Congratulations.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you to the gentleman from Florida. Thank you for so eloquently talking about the problems of austerity and this budget that is the path to austerity, to continued austerity in this country.

One of the statistics I think that's really worth mentioning, and this is from the Congressional Budget Office, is that from 1979 to 2007, the top 1 percent of income earners grew 278 percent, or about \$973,000 per household. In contrast, the middle 20 percent grew 25 percent, and the poorest 20 percent grew 16 percent.

So the very things that we just heard the gentleman from Florida talking about are very real; and that's why the Democrats on the committee, when we had a chance to try to amend the Republican path to austerity, instead we put out a budget amendment that said we would cap no family making \$250,000 or less, covering the vast, vast majority of Americans, would be held harmless under the proposals presented by the Republican budget.

They would not go along with that amendment because they had to protect the tax breaks for corporate jets, and they had to protect the tax breaks for oil companies, and they had to protect the other tax breaks that they had.

Now, we brought up that during the Clinton administration the top tax rate was at 39 percent, but the economy added 20 million jobs. So at 39 percent top tax rate, we added 20 million jobs.

During the Bush administration, we reduced that top rate down to 35 percent, and yet we lost a half a million jobs. So the argument that somehow having a lower top tax rate is going to create jobs is simply a myth. We saw that when the Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest were passed and we saw no economic recovery. And then when they were reauthorized, we still saw no economic recovery.

But where we did see an economic recovery was when we had the stimulus and recovery dollars that came through. And in my State of Wisconsin, I was on the Committee on Finance during that time. We had to authorize every single dollar that came through in recovery dollars in my State. And when we put forward the programs that went and built the roads and rebuilt the bridges and built schools, did repairs to schools, we had a report by the road building industry and the vertical

construction industry, not exactly your most progressive organizations, that said that 54,000 jobs were saved or created in the State of Wisconsin because of those recovery dollars.

And at the Federal level, in the Budget Committee, the head of the Congressional Budget Office, Dr. Elmendorf, I asked him point blank, were there jobs created by the recovery, because the same day the President gave the State of the Union, the Speaker of this House said that no jobs were created from the past recovery. And yet we were told by Dr. Elmendorf, from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, that up to 3.3 million jobs were saved or created.

So, again, part of what the Democrats talked about is how could we help provide some additional recovery dollars in the Back to Work Budget, which would specifically invest in those infrastructure projects into our schools, into our police and fire services. So that's a little bit about what we talked about down there.

But one last thing I would like to bring up and talk about that happens in the Republican version of the budget that does not happen in our version, the Back to Work Budget, the Progressive Caucus Budget, is the effect on Medicare.

Right now, half the people who receive Medicare make \$22,000 a year, and yet their health care costs are three times that of the average person. So some of our folks who are the most low-income seniors, who've been relying on the promise that they've paid into their entire lives for Medicare, are now having three times the costs of the average person, are going to see this new voucher program that, down the road, will eventually make them pay more and more immediately, but down the road, not keep up with inflation and cause people to make those tough choices in a lose-lose proposition, receive less health care or pay more for it when you can least afford to.

That's not fair. That promise that we've had as a Nation through Medicare, it's simply not fair to voucherize that program.

And then when you take the \$800 billion in cuts to the Medicaid budget, again, that largely goes to seniors in our States, you are going to see the access and the ability for senior citizens, especially people of modest and middle incomes, diminish because of this budget.

Now, we agree that the real culprit out there is rising health care costs. We have to, in a bipartisan way, address those. But you don't address them by balancing the budget on the backs of the people who can least afford it, and that's the middle class and the seniors of America.

So when you look at this budget from the Republicans in totality, and you look at the cuts to Medicare and the cuts to Medicaid, the protection of tax breaks for the most wealthy, for the special interests, for companies that

outsource jobs overseas, the lack of any investment in infrastructure or education, or research and development, when you listen to the stories that I've talked about from people from my district, from the very same county that Chairman RYAN and I share, who talk about devastating impacts of these cuts, we have a budget that is misplaced and will affect real people in the middle class.

I would just like to talk about one final part of the budget that really makes it really hard to, on top of all these cuts, think that a lot of serious thought went into it, and that's the fact that the Republican version of the budget repeals the Affordable Care Act, all of the benefits to the public, the millions of people who will gain access to health care, but it still takes the revenues brought in by the program. And we were told that when we asked questions in committee.

So, on one hand, to take away the program and say you're going to get rid of it, and on the other hand, to still take the revenues that are brought in by the program makes the budget not a very credible budget. And as I've said in committee, and I'll say again, if you're going to take those sort of false assumptions and put a budget together, you might as well say that we're going to hire leprechauns to take the pots of gold at the end of rainbows and count that as revenue, because it's about as realistic.

In the end, the Progressive Caucus is very proud of our Back to Work Budget. We are going to invest in infrastructure, we're going to invest in public workers, we're going to make sure that we're getting our fair share of resources that we need so that government can function to take care of the middle class and the people who need it the most. It will create 7 million American jobs, reduce unemployment to 5 percent, and yet still reduce our deficit by \$4.4 trillion.

□ 1840

It will strengthen Medicare and Medicaid and provide high-quality, low-cost medical coverage to millions of Americans. That's what the people of the country voted for in November. That's the budget we should be putting forward in this country, and that's the budget the Progressive Caucus puts out today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

RECOGNIZING THE CENTENNIAL OF THE ADVENT CHRISTIAN VILLAGE AT DOWLING PARK, FLORIDA

(Mr. YOHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a wonderful and unique community in my district, the Advent Christian Village at Dowling Park, Florida, which is now in its 100th year.

Scripture advises us that, to whom much has been given, much is returned. Thomas Dowling of Suwannee County, Florida, had this in mind a century ago when he set out to turn his thriving lumber business into a vision for the community. Mr. Dowling set aside some of his property that he was developing around Live Oak for the Advent Christian Church to use for ministry. Before long, a family of five orphaned siblings had come to live at Dowling Park. The Setzer children became the first residents of Advent Christian Church's Home and Orphanage, which also opened its doors to the elderly.

Today, Advent Christian Village is a leading-edge retirement community of more than 800 dynamic, welcoming members of America's Greatest Generation. While children no longer live at Advent Christian Village, they are an integral part of the ministry carried out by today's residents who, a century later, still take Thomas Dowling's vision to heart.

The story of the Advent Christian Village is one of Americans coming together, expressing generosity and kindness to one another and helping those in need. Dowling Park is one of the brightest spots in Suwannee County and the Third District, and I congratulate them on 100 years of ministry.

FORT REPORT: SEQUESTRATION, THE WASHINGTON WORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak today about the sequestration and fiscal affairs facing our country.

Earlier this month, I was back home in Lincoln, and I went to one of the local diners and saw my friend Norm, and Norm asked me a question. He said: JEFF, what are they doing about that word they keep using in Washington?

Well, Norm was referring to "sequestration," which took effect March 1. "Sequestration" is that inside-the-Beltway term for automatic spending reductions to the Federal budget. These reductions will be \$85 billion in the first year, with roughly half applied to military programs and half applied basically to everything else the government does, with the exception of retirement, health care, and other income support programs.

Mr. Speaker, I think it might help everyone if we had a little bit of history to clarify how we got to this moment.

A year-and-a-half ago, there were negotiations in Washington over what we call the debt ceiling. The debt ceiling must be lifted by us in Congress if the Federal Government cannot pay its bills and we must borrow more. We give that authority to the administra-

tion. The negotiation ended with three outcomes:

First, Congress would cut spending by an amount greater than the rise in the debt ceiling;

Second, a supercommittee would be formed to negotiate the right type of tax reform and the right type of spending reductions;

Third, automatic spending cuts, now known as the sequester, would take place—this was proposed by the President and agreed upon by us in Congress—if this supercommittee failed.

These automatic cuts to the budget, the sequestration, were supposed to be so distasteful to everyone that it was going to motivate us all to find creative and reasonable solutions to fix the budget crisis. But the supercommittee failed; now the sequester has kicked in.

Mr. Speaker, 70 percent of Americans want this deficit reduced. I imagine those numbers are probably higher in Nebraska, where I live, where fiscal responsibility is a core characteristic of family life, business ethics, as well as good governance. People know economically, mathematically, or intuitively that you can't spend more than you have. Citizens also want to see their government act in a reasonable fashion.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal budget deficit has been running more than \$1 trillion in the last few years, and our cumulative debt will top \$17 trillion this year, the size of our overall economic output in the country. The overspending and debt are serious impediments to economic recovery, and they also create national security problems.

Some in Washington want to halt any spending reductions at all. I don't believe this is an option. Washington must begin living in the real world. Something must be done. Two principles should be at work here: there must be reasonable budgetary reductions, while at the same time there must be deliberate delivery of smart and effective government services. While the sequester serves as a trigger for the first principle, it does not balance it with the second. Automatic cuts do not allow for discretion in determining which programs should stay or expand and which should be revised or eliminated due to ineffectiveness.

The sequestration also hits our military in a disproportionate manner and disrupts procurement and planning decisions that cannot operate on a short-term budgetary horizon. Mr. Speaker, we should keep the spirit of the sequestration—and preserve the fullness of these reductions—but continue to revise its implementation with the flexibility to make more precise cutbacks. The House recently passed a funding bill for the remainder of the fiscal year which gives the military this needed flexibility.

Mr. Speaker, as well, the Appropriations Committee recently held a hearing with the head of the Government Accountability Office, known as the

GAO. I raised the issue of GAO findings that cited 132 areas within the Federal Government with duplicative missions, with about 300 potential areas of action items that could be undertaken to tackle this redundancy problem. Consolidation of programs could officially save tens of billions of dollars, and unofficial estimates put that number in the hundreds of billions of dollars. Further questioning revealed that there is approximately \$385 billion of uncollected Federal revenue. The GAO report could serve as a guidepost on how we might achieve the right balance between reductions and more effective service delivery.

All in all, the fiscal disorder in Washington, Mr. Speaker, and the inability to budget in a responsible manner is undermining the ability of our economy to turn around. The careening from one governmental drama to another is undermining confidence in the institutions of government. While it is painful, the sequestration is serving as a call to all of us to promptly budget with propriety and boldness to get America's fiscal house in order.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

Mr. GARDNER (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of attending a family funeral.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 15, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

691. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-66; Introduction [Docket: FAR 2013-0076, Sequence 2] received February 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

692. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Extension of Authority for Use of Simplified Acquisition

Procedures for Certain Commercial Items [FAC 2005-66; FAR Case 2013-007; Item III; Docket 2013-0007, Sequence 13 (RIN: 9000-AM47) received February 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

693. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments [FAC 2005-66; Item IV; Docket 2013-0080, Sequence 2] received February 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

694. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-66; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket: FAR 2013-0078, Sequence 2] received February 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

695. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Changes to Time-and-Materials and Labor-Hour Contracts and Orders [FAC 2005-66; FAR Case 2011-025; Item II; Docket 2011-0025, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM28) received February 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

696. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Definition of Contingency Operation [FAC 2005-66; FAR Case 2013-003; Item I; Docket 2013-0003, Sequence 13 (RIN: 9000-AM48) received February 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

697. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1055; Directorate identifier 2012-NE-33-AD; Amendment 39-17351; AD 2013-03-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

698. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0731; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-020-AD; Amendment 39-17334; AD 2013-02-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

699. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc., Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0082; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-036-AD; Amendment 39-1731; AD 2013-01-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

700. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0639; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-005-AD; Amendment 39-17329; AD 2013-02-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

701. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0794; Directorate Identifier 2006-SW-04-AD; Amendment 39-17319; AD 2013-01-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

702. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp. Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0942; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-24-AD; Amendment 39-17355; AD 2013-03-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

703. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0732; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-022-AD; Amendment 39-17311; AD 2012-26-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

704. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0940; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-26-AD; Amendment 39-17321; AD 2013-01-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

705. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace LP (Type Certificate Previously Held by Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd.) Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2012-0986; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-077-AD; Amendment 39-17357; AD 2013-03-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

706. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0030; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-42-AD; Amendment 39-17325; AD 2013-02-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

707. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30886; Amdt. No. 505] received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

708. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30886; Amdt. No. 505] received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

709. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30884; Amdt. No. 3519] received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to

the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

710. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30885; Amdt. No. 3520] received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 1148. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payment for services of qualified radiologist assistants under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 1149. A bill to provide for funding for construction and major rehabilitation for projects located on inland and intracoastal waterways of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1150. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to preserve the effectiveness of medically important antimicrobials used in the treatment of human and animal diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 1151. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the triennial International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ENYART (for himself and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1152. A bill to provide for the safe and reliable navigation of the Mississippi River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1153. A bill to establish a pilot program to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of allowing non-Federal interests to carry out certain water infrastructure projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HOLT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CHU, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LANDEVIN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. MENG, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NADLER, Ms.

NORTON, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. FARR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H.R. 1154. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to eliminate the exemption for aggregation of emissions from oil and gas sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. McHENRY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. BARR, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. LANCE, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan):

H.R. 1155. A bill to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 1156. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust the boundary of the Stephen Mather Wilderness and the North Cascades National Park in order to allow the rebuilding of a road outside of the floodplain while ensuring that there is no net loss of acreage to the Park or the Wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 1157. A bill to ensure public access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain in the Hanford Reach National Monument for educational, recreational, historical, scientific, cultural, and other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 1158. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. DAINES):

H.R. 1159. A bill to modify the Forest Service Recreation Residence Program by implementing a simple, equitable, and predictable procedure for determining cabin user fees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 1160. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to set the retirement benefits age for today's six-year-olds at age 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 1161. A bill to modify the project for navigation, Mississippi River Ship Channel, Gulf of Mexico to Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 1162. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to make improvements in the

Government Accountability Office; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MICA, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 1163. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, to revise requirements relating to Federal information security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 1164. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing resolutions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. LATTA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. McKEON, and Mr. CARTER):

H.R. 1165. A bill to greatly enhance the Nation's environmental, energy, economic, and national security by terminating long-standing Federal prohibitions on the domestic production of abundant offshore supplies of oil and natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 1166. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 100 North Church Street in Las Cruces, New Mexico, as the "Edwin L. Mechem United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1167. A bill to quitclaim surface rights to certain Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management in Virginia City, Nevada, to Storey County, Nevada, to resolve conflicting ownership and title claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1168. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management, to convey to the City of Carlin, Nevada, in exchange for consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States, to any Federal land within that city that is under the jurisdiction of that agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1169. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy certain Federal land in Churchill County, Nevada; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1170. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation, to convey, by quitclaim deed, to the City of Fernley, Nevada, all right, title, and interest of the United States, to any Federal land within that city that is under the jurisdiction of either of those agencies; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BENISHEK (for himself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. O'Rourke):

H.R. 1171. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1172. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent the payment of unemployment compensation to individuals discharged for drug or alcohol use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. REED, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. KIND, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BERA of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 1173. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of voluntary advance care planning consultation under Medicare and Medicaid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FLORES, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. WOODALL):

H.R. 1174. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to improve the functioning and transparency of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Open Market Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MENG, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. CHU, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H.R. 1175. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study with respect to stormwater runoff from oil and gas operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUIZENGA of

Michigan, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 1176. A bill to establish a commission to examine the United States monetary policy, evaluate alternative monetary regimes, and recommend a course for monetary policy going forward; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1177. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect more victims of domestic violence by preventing their abusers from possessing or receiving firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 1178. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for graduate medical education partnerships in States with a low physician-resident-to-general-population ratio; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself and Mr. LATHAM):

H.R. 1179. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. GRIMM):

H.R. 1180. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. SALMON, Mr. AMASH, and Mr. PITTENGER):

H.R. 1181. A bill to reduce the annual rate of pay of Members of Congress by 8.2 percent; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS (for himself, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. GOWDY, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROSS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. REED, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mrs. ROBY):

H.R. 1182. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to repeal the authority to make performance-based bonus payments to States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1183. A bill to withdraw certain Federal lands and interests located in Pima and Santa Cruz counties, Arizona, from the mining and mineral leasing laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 1184. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for lessened penalties for certain violations of the anti-structuring laws when violations are with respect to certain domestic financial institutions and are not taken in connection with another crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1185. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a deadline for restricting sewage dumping into the Great Lakes and to fund programs and activities for improving wastewater discharges into the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia):

H.R. 1186. A bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal to each of Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods in recognition of their contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 1187. A bill to designate certain National Forest System lands and public lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior in the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming as wilderness and wild and scenic rivers, to provide for the establishment of a Northern Rockies Wildlife Habitat and Corridors Information System and Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 1188. A bill to ensure and foster continued safety and quality of care and a competitive marketplace by exempting independent pharmacies from the antitrust laws in their negotiations with health plans and health insurance insurers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 1189. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act with respect to the exportation of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 1190. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior may accept bids on any new oil and gas leases of Federal lands (including submerged lands) only from bidders certifying that all oil produced pursuant to such leases, and all refined petroleum products produced from such oil, shall be offered for sale only in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 1191. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior may accept bids on any new oil and gas leases of Federal lands (including submerged lands) only from bidders certifying that all natural gas produced pursuant to such leases shall be offered for sale only in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK:

H.R. 1192. A bill to redesignate Mammoth Peak in Yosemite National Park as "Mount Jessie Benton Fremont"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. GERLACH, Mr.

NUGENT, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania);

H.R. 1193. A bill to require each owner of a dwelling unit assisted under the section 8 rental assistance voucher program to remain current with respect to local property and school taxes and to authorize a public housing agency to use such rental assistance amounts to pay such tax debt of such an owner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 1194. A bill to terminate the National Flood Insurance Program and related mandatory purchase and compliance requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. CRENSHAW):

H.R. 1195. A bill to establish a program to provide grants to nonprofit organizations to enable such organizations to assign and support volunteers to assist foreign countries in the administration of their natural resources in an environmentally sustainable manner; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1196. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to make local funds of the District of Columbia for a fiscal year available for use by the District at the beginning of the fiscal year at the rate of operations provided under the local budget act for the fiscal year if the regular District of Columbia appropriation bill for a fiscal year does not become law prior to the beginning of such fiscal year; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 1197. A bill to waive the arbitrage rules for certain bonds issued in 1990 and partially defeased in 1996; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABLON (for himself and Mr. FALCOMA-VAEGA):

H.R. 1198. A bill to provide for American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to be treated as States for certain criminal justice programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Ms. BASS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 1199. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 1200. A bill to provide for health care for every American and to control the cost and enhance the quality of the health care system; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, Armed Services, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself and Ms. SCHWARTZ):

H.R. 1201. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 1202. A bill to prevent a fiscal crisis by enacting legislation to balance the Federal budget through reductions of discretionary and mandatory spending; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1203. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide an Inspector General for the judicial branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 1204. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish an Aviation Security Advisory Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 1205. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to require health insurance issuers and group health plans to disclose information regarding how certain taxes and fees impact the amount of premiums, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1206. A bill to grant the Secretary of the Interior permanent authority to authorize States to issue electronic duck stamps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JONES, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri):

H.J. Res. 35. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to balance the Federal budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.J. Res. 36. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution requiring that each agency and department's funding is justified; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCALISE (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARTON, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DENTHAM, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HALL, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUELSEKAMP, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LATTI, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RADEL, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STEWART, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. YODER, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H. Res. 117. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Government should not bail out State and local government employee pension plans or other plans that provide post-employment benefits to State and local government retirees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SABLON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BASS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LOEBACK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CLAY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. HOLT):

H. Res. 118. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Professional Social Work Month and World Social Work Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. WAXMAN introduced a bill (H.R. 1207) for the relief of Allan Bolor Kelley; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 1148.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States)."

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 1149.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1150.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 1151.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. ENYART:

H.R. 1152.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 1153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes).

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 1155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 1156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, section 3

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 1157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, section 3

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 1158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, section 3

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 1159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, section 3

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 1160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 1161.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1162.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1163.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Sec. 8

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 1164.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 1165.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article IV, section 3 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 2 (empowering Congress to make rules and regulations respecting property belonging to the people of the United States), Article I, section 8 of the

United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress). Furthermore, this bill amends the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331), which Congress previously enacted pursuant to similar authority.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 1166.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1167.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1168.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1169.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1170.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 1171.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2

"The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States;"

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1172.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1173.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill modifies the Social Security Act, which Congress enacted pursuant to its powers under the commerce clause of the U.S. Constitution, as well as its powers to tax and spend for the general welfare. Congress has the power under those provisions to enact this legislation as well.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 1174.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5, "The Congress shall have the Power . . . To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof . . ."

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 1175.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 1176.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5, "The Congress shall have the Power . . . To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof . . ."

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1177.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 1178.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 1179.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 1180.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. DESANTIS:

H.R. 1181.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 6, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. DESJARLAIS:

H.R. 1182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make

all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1183.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 1184.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 1185.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, giving Congress the power to enact necessary and proper regulations for interstate commerce.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 1186.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 1188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (Relating to Commercial Activity Regulation)

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. McCLINTOCK:

H.R. 1192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (the Property Clause), which confers on Congress the power to make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 1193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 1194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill accompanying this statement delivers powers back to the states, pursuant to the Tenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 1195.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this legislation.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 1197.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SABLON:

H.R. 1198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, section 8, clause 3 and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 1199.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 1200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 1201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 1202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, and Article III, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 1204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution, including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 1205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is pursuant to the following:

1) Article I, Section 1 "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

2) Article I, Section 8: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States . . ."

. . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 1206.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 1207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power to "establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization". The Supreme Court has long found that this provision of the Constitution grants Congress plenary power over immigration policy. As the Court found in *Galvan v. Press*, 347 U.S. 522, 531 (1954), "that the formulation of policies [pertaining to the entry of aliens and their right to remain here] is entrusted exclusively to Congress has become about as firmly imbedded in the legislative and judicial tissues of our body politic as any aspect of our government." And, as the Court found in *Kleindienst v. Mandel*, 408 U.S. 753, 766 (1972) (quoting *Boutillier v. INS*, 387 U.S. 118, 123 (1967)), "[t]he Court without exception has sustained Congress' 'plenary power to make rules for the admission of aliens and to exclude those who possess those characteristics which Congress has forbidden.'"

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 35.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution of the United States, which states "The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution . . ."

By Mr. PERRY:

H.J. Res. 36.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the authority to propose Constitutional amendments.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 55: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
 H.R. 148: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 164: Mr. ENYART and Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 180: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 181: Mr. PETERS of California.
 H.R. 183: Ms. CHU and Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 222: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
 H.R. 258: Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RUNYAN, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
 H.R. 269: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 274: Ms. ESTY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 279: Ms. MOORE and Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 282: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
 H.R. 283: Mr. KINGSTON.
 H.R. 285: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 300: Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 303: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. AMODEI.
 H.R. 309: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. PITTEGER.
 H.R. 318: Mr. MARINO.
 H.R. 322: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 324: Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PAYNE,

Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 327: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 330: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 332: Ms. ESTY, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 342: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 357: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 360: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. ROTHFUS, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. ESTY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. MENG, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 366: Mr. WOLF and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 367: Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 377: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 404: Ms. ESTY and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 445: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 452: Mr. PETERS of California and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 474: Mr. MORAN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 482: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 486: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 497: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. CAPITO, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 521: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. PETERS of California, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 525: Mr. DAINES and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 541: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 543: Ms. KUSTER, Ms. MENG, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 556: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 573: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 574: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MAF-FEI, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BERA of California, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 578: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 580: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 582: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 597: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 599: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 601: Ms. CHU, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 627: Mr. TURNER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 633: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 635: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 636: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 637: Mr. YOHIO.

H.R. 654: Mr. HANNA and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 677: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 684: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 685: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 688: Mr. CLAY, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 715: Mr. HANNA and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 718: Mr. FLEMING and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 741: Mr. PETRI and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 755: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 763: Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 779: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 792: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MICA, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. YODER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GARDNER, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 795: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 797: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 812: Mr. OWENS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 824: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 833: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. YODER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 839: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 842: Ms. MOORE and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 847: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 850: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. FOXX, Ms. CHU, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 851: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 858: Mr. FARR, Mr. HARPER, Mr. JONES, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. LONG, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. NUNES, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. ENYART, Mr. WELCH, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KEATING and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 863: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 880: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 893: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 903: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 913: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 922: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 924: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 938: Mr. UPTON, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MICA, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. CHU, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 946: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 955: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 958: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 961: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 974: Mr. COHEN and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 976: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. YODER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PITTEGER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 990: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 996: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1005: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 1014: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1024: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1029: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1039: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1072: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. YODER, and Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 1102: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1106: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1108: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1110: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. SABLON.

H.R. 1120: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. KELLY, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 1124: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1126: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 1128: Mr. BONNER and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 1133: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.J. Res. 21: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.J. Res. 25: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.J. Res. 28: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. YODER.

H.J. Res. 33: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MAFFEL, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. DENHAM.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. POSEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MULLIN,

Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H. Res. 19: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H. Res. 24: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Res. 36: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H. Res. 60: Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 72: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H. Res. 89: Mr. SCHOCK.

H. Res. 90: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. SIRES.

H. Res. 97: Mr. BONNER and Mr. FLEMING.

H. Res. 100: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. TAKANO.

H. Res. 114: Mr. HALL.